

## Public Comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft GMP/EIS

**Correspondence ID:** 1    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,08,2013 10:25:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in response to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan.

I do not support the NPS preferred alternative, Alternative B. I feel this restricts locals/year round residents use and ability to access and enjoy the river ways as families have for generations.  
Some examples of the unnecessary restrictions include:

\*National Park Service wants to restrict an activity primarily partaken by the local resident. They are doing this by restricting motorized use of 34% rver year round and an additional 14% dring the summer time. That is 48% o the river basically closed to the locals during the peak season. Yet they didnt restrict nonmotorized visitor (tourist) at all, in fact all areas of the river are open year round.

\*They want to close about 10 miles of roads primarily used by locals, and turn them into hiking trails. I pity the handicapped or the aged local population.

\*It closes an untold amount of access to the river. I am sure those accesses are primarily used by local residents.

\*They also want to close approximately 65 miles of horse trails. The local equestrian population and the economy will suffer as a result of this.

\*It eliminates traditional camping. It requires that campers only camp in designated areas. So you wouldnt be able to able to just pick a gravel bar and set up a tent for the night. Also all designated campsites have a fee.

I feel the no action alternative is the best course of action.

\*It treats all visitors; local, floater, hiker, and equestrian alike. It gives them equal access.

\*It doesnt restrict motor boats to nearly 50% o the river during peak times, while it gives floaters 100% acess anytime.

\*It doesnt turn traditional local roads to hiking trails, yet hikers could still hike if they chose to.

\*It also doesnt eliminate traditional camping, where you can float, boat, hike, or ride until you find a place to camp for the night.

I feel that the National Park Service has unrealistic ideas that they can create a silent area of the river where there are no unnatural sounds. They must think that visitors arent going to talk, cough, breath, launch or exit their craft, touch the water with anything, or even move. They also must not take into account the highways and county roads in the area and the vehicle sounds that emit from normal travel. I feel that that National Park Service and any visitor which thinks they can have a completely silent visit is completely out of their minds.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,09,2013 00:14:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** At this time I would advocate minimal change from current use plans. I utilize the park for canoeing and camping - generally multi-day floats of varying lengths. Because of associated activities, including hiking from various river points and interactions with others, as well as vagaries of river flow rates it is not possible to closely monitor progress and plan for set campground way point targets. Accordingly, I and those traveling with me engage in low-impact primitive camping at available locations along the river. Plans which restrict the ability to use the river in such a non-guided format would seriously detract from enjoyment and access to this recreational and

wilderness resource.

A great deal of my enjoyment is gained by the close access to the river without being surrounded by large groups of individuals, especially at or near sunrise and sunset when prime wildlife viewing opportunities occur. There is also a great deal of enjoyment to be derived to being on the river either before or after less experienced canoeists and campers have yet to put in or have already taken out of the rivers.

While an urban dweller, I choose to recreate in areas that tend to be primitive and off the grid as a form of disconnection and rejuvenation from the travails of modern living. I think imposing additional regulation on when and where one could camp along the river - with its concurrent forced congregation with other groups of users would seriously degrade the river systems use for such restorative and pastoral pursuits.

For all of the above reasons, I would encourage continuation of the current management plan, or in the alternative the plan that would least impact use of the river by non-motorized watercraft and least disturb availability for primitive camping along the river in seclusion or limited access.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,09,2013 06:06:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** You tell us the government doesn't have any money. You can't fund the projects you have, yet you want to involve yourself in things that you aren't well versed in such as managing Mo waterways and forest areas. Please let the land owners in MO. of the counties affected have their say and let them decide what is best for their economy and have control over the land and waterways. I am a trail rider and I come to Mo at least 2 times per year to ride trails. Part of the reason I come to MO is because in Illinois, my home state government has already closed down and taken away my right to ride on Illinois trails that I used to ride. Please don't let this happen in MO.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,09,2013 10:29:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I greatly prefer Alternative A, however, Alternative B ( NPS Preferred) is acceptable. I am curious as to why the Eleven Point River was left out of this plan. Please respond.

Thanks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,09,2013 11:19:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like NO ACTION taken on the boat horsepower for Current River.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,09,2013 11:26:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I prefer that the ONSR take no action and continue the current policies.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 7    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,09,2013 11:35:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am commenting on the draft general management plan for the ONSR. I am a canoeist who frequently visits the Current and Jack's Fork rivers. I am strongly opposed to both alternatives B (favored by the NPS) and C. As I understand it, both these alternatives open more stretches of the river to motorized boat traffic.

I have been a paddler for a long time. I can tell you from abundant personal experience that while some power boat operators are considerate of paddlers, many are not. There are many places that power boat owners can go. There are relatively few natural waterways left that are free of the noise, pollution, and wakes that accompany power boats. The Current and Jack's Fork are two waterways that in that latter category that can be paddled year round. Please preserve them as such.

Sincerely, Peter Blanc

---

**Correspondence ID:** 8    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,09,2013 14:12:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I prefer the ONSR take no action and continue with the current management practices

---

**Correspondence ID:** 9    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,09,2013 14:35:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There are too many unnecessary and costly rules and regulations already in place. I want the park service to take no action, unless there is a plan to lift some rules and open some riverfront for free day use for the people, especilly the locals. Unless a person owns a boat, owns riverfront, or pays a concessioner, they cannot enjoy a day on the riverbank picnicking, fishing, and swimming with the kids. The familes of this area has been stripped of their culture and heritage.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 10    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,09,2013 17:17:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like there no changes made in the 20 yr plan what your preferred plan is going to do nothing but hurt our local economy by restricted how many people will be on the river. There haven't been problems on the river with the current rules so I prefer we don't change them

---

**Correspondence ID:** 11    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,10,2013 07:32:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We hold our group rendezvous on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers twice a year. We have to do it off season because the river traffic is too heavy during tourist season. Please restrict boat traffic on the river according to Alternative A: prohibiting it on the Jack's Fork entirely and on the Current River down to Two Rivers during peak season, and down to Round Spring in the off-season.

I realize that this will make people with motor boats unhappy but consider this: When they are on the river, they ruin it for those of us who are there to enjoy the beauty, the wildlife, the sounds of nature. In particular, they destroy the quiet and create wake. We don't do that. When we're on the river, we don't ruin the experience of others on the river. In all fairness, if someone wants to bring a large fishing boat on the river, they should paddle it, not use a motor.

I am sure there are plenty of wonderful bodies of water where those who love nature and love to pollute and make a lot of noise can congregate. They will be able to do this without ruining each others' experience. That would be fair.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,10,2013 11:06:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for taking action with the thorough study on options to protect the Ozark National Riverway. I visit annually to enjoy the beauty and quiet atmosphere of the river. However, I only float on weekdays during the spring\summer months simply due to large crowds and noise from visitors and also to avoid motorized boats.

I am glad to see both Options A & B help provide better controls on motorized boats and help protect the river with fewer access points. While I am supportive of both Option A & B I really do like the further controls of motorized boats of Option A. I feel the 'No Action' option would be irresponsible and unfortunate. I hope the final decision does not head in that direction. We need to protect the river for future generations to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,10,2013 22:32:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Preferred plan B seems to be a decent proposal as well as C. Plan A will only hurt local people. A lot of focus seems to be on motorized boating and access points. None really address the canoe liveries which is 99 percent of pollution and damage to the river. I think the Maggards shouldn't be allowed to hold 4 permits. An the amount of people on weekends from cedar to pull trite is ridiculous. But I'm just a hillbilly. Who likes to use a motorized boat and a vehicle to enjoy the river that 4 generations of my family lived on its banks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 14    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,11,2013 00:35:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am always amazed at how our government try's to work. Your plan includes, accelerated melting of sea ice (which can further alter global weather patterns)

What has sea ice melting have to do with a park in the middle of the USA?

Am I missing something or is this mostly smoke and mirror's to do what ever the park Super wants to do at the time he want's to make a change.

I have been on the river since the early 70's and the late 80's were the hay day and if you think the number of users are the same as in 89 you weren't here then.

It may be time for the people of Missouri to take back their river. The Missouri constitution states that all free flowing water in the state belongs to the people of Missouri.

If you haven't figured it out by now I support the No-action Alternative.

I would even go as far as to say it would be better run if it was privatized.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 15    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,11,2013 07:42:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Starting in 1972 I have been floating the eleven point river and now no longer do so unless i can go during the week which is hard to do because of work. The reason i stopped floating this river is the jet boat use has become unbearable.sometimes a boat roars by every five minutes and ruins the whole natural experience. I was also swamped once by boat wake. I told the canoe rental person we would never come back and did not for ten years until recently i went out of season and it was fine. You have no chance to get rid of these boats due to local politics but i think maybe two or three weekends could be set aside for floaters during the summer in the same way areas are closed to hikers during hunting season. I sent a request to MDC for a study that was done by Washington University on the effect of jet boats on fish spawning compared with prop boats. The study used a water depth of 2 or 3 feet for the comparison which of course defeated the whole purpose of the study since jet boats can run in 6 inches of water.A real study under actual usage conditions would find these boats destroy fish spawning sites thereby damaging the natural fish populations and crustaceans also.That would be a basis for limiting their use during certain seasons or at certain areas. I think these boats could use the area below Riverton, Mo. and have plenty of recreational opportunity.The river widens out and is deeper there.  
These fish populations are required to be protected by law aren't they?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 16    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,11,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Gentlemen;

Having perused the three alternatives proffered by ONSR, I lean strongly toward Alternative "A" due to its minimal increase in "Commercialized" usage of the Park. I feel strongly that this park, out of all our National Parks, should be saved in as primitive and pristine a manner as possible. This Park is already among the more secluded, and should be protected for use by those who prefer that kind of Park experience. There are already a number of Parks that cater to the "Camper/motel" park visitor. I would like to see \*something\* saved among them all, that is reserved for a truly "Primitive" Park visit.

In this regard, I am troubled and a bit confused by the proposed "prohibition" on gravel bar camping. I have no problem with closing the gravel bars to vehicular traffic, this should have happened long ago. However, one of the greatest draws to the ONSR is ones ability to float/camp among these wonders of Nature. To limit the experience, ie "Camping on gravel bars would be allowed in designated campsites only", defeats the purpose, and denigrates a wilderness experience that we have the rare opportunity to engender with this new Use Management Plan. There are already a number of \*designated\* primitive sites on the rivers...Bay Creek on the Jacks Fork is a prime example. If you would, please clarify your meaning/intent in this regard.

As a member of the Missouri Stream Team Program, and founder of ST#713, I am on these rivers year-round, and am familiar with the ebb and flow of both the Rivers and the politics of ONSR. I am a staunch supporter of the Park Service, and hope that your future policies will only enhance the "Park Experience" that I have come to enjoy.

Sincerely;

Ted Haviland  
Stream Team #713  
(Upper Jacks Fork River Rats)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 17    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,11,2013 13:37:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Table 5, on page 49 of the draft management plan, titled "Recreation Activities by Management Zone" indicates that "camping on gravel bars would only be allowed in designated areas" in all three river-management zones.

Table 13, on page 126 titled "Summary of Key Differences Among the Alternatives" indicates that "camping on gravel bars would be allowed in designated campgrounds only" for all three proposed alternatives.

Does the NPS propose to restrict gravel bar camping for paddlers on overnight river trips to certain designated sites? If so, which sites?

If it is not the intention of the NPS to restrict gravel bar camping for overnight river trippers, this needs to be spelled out clearly.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 18    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,11,2013 13:46:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would be totally oppose to any plan that included a ban on "float in" gravel bar camping. - Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 19    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,11,2013 14:24:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** After reviewing the GMP Plan I must recommend "NO ACTION". Our government is in such dis-array and in such a financial crisis I just do not see how we can possibly implement more regulation.

Our local communities depend on the recreation of the rivers for their economy, local fun & entertainment and family traditions. We live this and depend weekly on our right to be able to go to the river when we choose, where we choose.

It's sad that it take 524 pages to explain what the NPS wants to propose; but then again that is what is wrong with our Country. The government wanting to regulate America more.

NO Action; NO Action; NO Action!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 20    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,11,2013 15:14:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the No Action Alternative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 21    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,11,2013 17:14:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the No Action on our river ways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 22    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,11,2013 20:25:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** "Alternative A" sounds ideal. Seclusion, primitive, quiet ... sounds like a good plan.

---

THINGS I WOULD LIKE TO NOT SEE: Motorboats, more concession launch spots, more horse trails, more horse camps, etc.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 23    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,12,2013 07:20:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO Change Needed, NO ACTION PLAN

---

**Correspondence ID:** 24    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,12,2013 07:25:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO ACTION! NO ACTION! NO ACTION! We DO NOT want any of our rights on our Current River or Jacks Fork River to change. Our local economies depend on the rivers and many of our families, mine included, depend on our rivers to carry on our family traditions that we love and treasure from year to year. I want NO ACTION! Ozarkians do not want a General Management Plan/Wilderness Study/EIS.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 25    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,12,2013 07:30:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I choose the no action alternative for the GMP of the ONSR. It doesn't matter which interest group you come from or are associated with, any change will take away our rights that we have now to enjoy the ONSR. I feel that everyone should be able to enjoy the outdoors as much as possible regardless of the interest group they fall under. It doesn't matter if you enjoy hiking, boating, floating, canoeing, horseback riding, ATV riding, camping, driving to your favorite swimming hole, bird watching, hunting, or site seeing. ANY CHANGE WOULD TAKE AWAY SOMETHING THAT WE HAVE NOW!! I choose the NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE!!  
Andrew Hampton

---

**Correspondence ID:** 26    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,12,2013 07:41:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I see no reason to change the existing rules/regulations.

---

I recommend "No Action"

---

**Correspondence ID:** 27    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,12,2013 08:03:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support No Action. Please do not take away our ability to enjoy our beautiful river system. Generations have enjoyed the natural beauty of the rivers and I hope that my children and grandchildren will always have the same opportunity. Please be mindful of the negative impact from the proposed changes and strongly consider the impact to the individuals that actually use and enjoy the rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 28    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,12,2013 08:17:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I choose NO ACTION for the GMP. I have spent my entire life on the Current River, year round. It is a way of life and economy for our community here in Ellington, Missouri. We as locals respect the Current and we take great care including having annual trash clean ups. We do not litter nor destroy the area in any way, shape, or form. We treasure it. We appreciate the greatness of the outdoors and our rural area. Any further regulations will only take away more rights we have to the river and the ONSR. That is why I support NO ACTION for the GMP, 110%. If there is more regulations added to the ONSR, we are limited to the area, and the government gains one more piece of our freedom. Activities in the area encourage wonderful aspects of nature and gets back to the basics of life. Here is isn't about technology and materialistic items, its about connecting with nature and enjoying the small things in life. Why take this away? This is important in today's society. WE NEED OUR FULL RIGHTS TO THE ONSR! I VOTE NO ACTION FOR THE GMP!!!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 29    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,12,2013 09:10:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly favor "Alternative A" among the proposed management plans for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Options B and C will in my opinion degrade the experience of those enjoying the rivers.

Please adopt Alternative A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 30    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,12,2013 10:18:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm recommending NO Action. I grew up on this river, camping here EVERY year. I've spent many countless hours fishing, camping, floating, fish fries, playing music over the campfire, and making endless memories with my family. This was passed down to me, and now I have now passed this down to my kids generation and teaching them to appreciate it and LOVE it the way I do. We've also helped so many people along the way either canoeists who didn't know what they were doing, and got themselves in a bad situation in a root wad, or boaters' who've had trouble and many people who have needed medical attention and stopped at the gravel bar for help..... We've helped them all, we've picked up trash not only at the gravel bar, but in the river from Owl's Bend to Paint Rock... Do not take this away from us...

---

**Correspondence ID:** 31    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,12,2013 10:32:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** No action plan. Please do not change this river. Leave it to the locals to enjoy!

Please keep my personal informaiton private

---

**Correspondence ID:** 32    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,12,2013 12:10:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Can not open file. "File damaged" Sabotaged already?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 33    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,12,2013 13:24:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Absolutely NO action should be taken by the NPS in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 34    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,12,2013 16:59:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to see Plan "A" implemented. Here is why I think it offers the choice.

I have been going to the Current and Jacks Fork rivers for over 30 years. In the last 10 years especially it has become increasingly apparent that the crowds are really taking their toll. Too many canoes are being put in by outfitters, but far more troubling to me is the many illegal roads, trails, and access points that have been created in recent years - I have witnessed firsthand rampant ATV use on gravel bars and in the stream bed as well as ordinary vehicles pulling right out onto gravel bars or in the river!

Motorized watercraft on these waterways have also increased to the point where I am concerned not just about the loss of peace and solitude, but also believe there is a serious safety threat. Many of these boats are going way too fast in water where people are swimming or fishing and the margin for error is very slim.

Horses - I love horseback riding, but it is starting to get out of hand on these rivers. Way too many horses are pounding the stream banks and fouling the water of these rivers and tearing up the trails.

So in summary, 1) No more new accesses, 2) Close all illegal ones and the roads and trails going to them. And 3) I'd like to see future discussion of limiting the # of boats that can put in on a given day as well as the # of horses that can go out. All of these things and the ONSR "might" eventually heal and get back to the way it should be. As a National Park the enjoyment of many should not be ruined by just a few. Missouri has many, many other public places to go to run motorboats, ATV's and horseback riding. These riverways are definitely not what they used to be and something needs to be done.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 35    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,12,2013 18:55:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Many of us would like to find information about what changes are being proposed about changes to our river. where do and when do we find this list of new ideas??

---

**Correspondence ID:** 36    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,12,2013 19:37:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Finally found 500 page doc.. thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 37    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,13,2013 08:00:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please leave the log yard area on current as is... Why do people think they need to change things that has been perfectly fine for 75 years.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 38    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,13,2013 08:37:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in favor of No Action. I do not want my river use restricted in any way shape or form. I want my children and grand children to be able to enjoy the river the same way I do right now.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 39    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,13,2013 08:39:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in favor of NO action! Leave our rights as they are, we do not want our river use restricted in any way!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 40    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,13,2013 08:40:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Leave our river use unrestricted. No action!



---

**Correspondence ID:** 41    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,13,2013 08:42:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm in favor of No action and no restriction! I want my grand kids to be able to enjoy the same river use I've enjoyed all my life.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 42    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,13,2013 08:46:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No action, no restriction! Restriction will have a huge impact on our daily lives. The rights we enjoy should not be taken away. I want my kids to be able to have the same joy I have in the rivers, without being told where they can go and what they can and can't do.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 43    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,13,2013 10:05:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

I am an avid user of the riverways, making approximately 10 trips a year to overnight canoe and camp along the river. What makes the park especially special to me is the beauty and incredible character that the Jack's fork and Current river provide. I have been visiting the area for about 15 years and I have seen the degradation and overuse by jetboats, tubers, canoes, and horses. I had an especially bad experience with a group of 4 drugged out and drunk tubers who attempted to steal my canoe off a gravel bar just before dark one night last summer so that they could make it to the take out before dark (roberts field access).

It is because of these reasons that I would highly support alternative A. Lots of other rivers in the ozarks provide opportunities to drink and innertube, ride horses, or blast up and downstream in a jet boat with no regard for canoes or other river users. I really hope that this general management plan leads to more protection for such an outstanding resource.

On another note, I would very much like to see some fishing regulations placed on smallmouth bass on the current river from two rivers to van buren. The river has the ability to produce the biggest smallmouth bass in the ozarks if regulations are enacted and enforced.

Andrew Coursey  
Southern Illinois University  
Center for Fisheries, Aquaculture, and Aquatic Sciences  
1409 W. Walnut  
Carbondale, IL 62901  
319-572-1009

---

**Correspondence ID:** 44    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,13,2013 10:25:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I can't comment on the draft plan if I can't get it! Something is wrong with download (today 11/13/2013). I tried a couple of times this morning and loads to 9.9megs and then comes up with an Internet Explorer internal error message. Please fix. I would like to review document. If you can't find anything wrong, I guess it could be my older (Windows XP) computer and I'm still on dial up. But I have down-loaded even larger pdf documents before without issue. My adobe program is up-to-date. I will check your website again this week to see if problem has been fixed. If you find no problems with the document or the way you are allowing access on your end, can you please send a me CD or DVD copy of it instead? Thanks.

Randall T. Long  
RR1 Box 314  
Ellington, MO 63636

PS this doesn't need to be on general comment document, but if you chose to put it there, please withhold my address.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 45    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,13,2013 10:43:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** overly complex document. The riverway should be left alone. NO ACTION.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 46    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,13,2013 11:39:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We have camped for the past 36 years enjoying family get togethers, fish frys, & music partys, etc.  
We choose the "NO Action" plan.  
Please let us camp there again!!  
Leave it the way it is...  
Thank you, Jerome Bales

---

**Correspondence ID:** 47    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,13,2013 11:42:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We have camped for the past 36 years enjoying family get togethers, fish frys, & music partys, etc.  
We choose the "NO Action" plan.  
Please let us camp there again!!  
Leave it the way it is...  
Thank you, Jerome Bales

---

**Correspondence ID:** 48    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,13,2013 11:45:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We have camped for the past 36 years enjoying family get togethers, fish frys, & music partys, etc.  
We choose the "NO Action" plan.  
Please let us camp there again!!  
Leave it the way it is...  
Thank you, Jerome Bales

---

**Correspondence ID:** 49    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,13,2013 11:48:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We have camped for the past 36 years enjoying family get togethers, fish frys, & music partys, etc.  
We choose the "NO Action" plan.  
Please let us camp there again!!  
Leave it the way it is...  
Thank you, Stevie N. Bales

---

**Correspondence ID:** 50    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,13,2013 11:51:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The language is unclear regarding gravel bar access via canoe to camp along the ONSR. I sure hope this isn't included in the "no camping unless designated" propositions. My only preferable way to camp is via a river accessed, non-road accessed gravel bar.

Steve King

<http://www.MissouriScenicRivers.com>

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/MissouriScenicRivers/>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 51    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,13,2013 12:02:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I agree with Missouri Congressman Jason Smith in that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways are already over managed. There is no need to add more regulations to keep people from enjoying activities that have been legal and enjoyed for years past. I support the no action proposal. I also support no further encroachment from the NPS on our public lands. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 52    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,13,2013 13:16:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm on the Current at least one day most weeks of the year and have been using the area since the '70's. The last few decades I've noticed increasingly it's more difficult to find a campsite where someone doesn't come into camp on a horse, ATV, or 4WD. This is especially true from Cedar Grove to Akers. The Flying W area ESPECIALLY has far too many ways to the river. You need to limit all these accesses that were not commonly used before the days of ATV's and everyone having 4WD vehicles.

I'm also afraid that I'm seeing the upper Current deteriorate into an area like the Eminence to Shawnee Creek section of the Jack's Fork with all the horse traffic. During the summer it's tough to find a place to urinate without a horseback rider coming up on you. Thank God for wintertime! How long before all that extra traffic from this proliferation of accesses affects the heron rookery in this stretch? Back in the early '80's I used to frequently fish Eminence to Two Rivers. I stopped when it started smelling like a barn yard. I hated to give up my favorite fishing stretch and the place I first saw otters and wild horses, but you allowed it to be raped in the name of the all mighty dollar. PLEASE, do not let this scenario replay itself on the upper Current!

Also, what's up with the private residence you allowed below Pulltite? I thought the riverways was protected? My friends and I were very disenchanted to see that built. It was especially disturbing before you put up the fence; at least they don't seem to have all the parties and crap on their "Private" gravel bar now. My friends and I used to use that as a lunch stop, but no more. I think ONSR should be ashamed for moving out the poor folk that resided in the area only to allow the "Elite" to build there decades later! I HOPE this does not continue, however; I have very little faith in anyone in administration with the Dept of Interior.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 53    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,13,2013 14:20:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sirs,

Thank you for considering my comments. I have spent many years boating on these rivers. My main concern is any suggested horsepower changes. I am a landowner in Carter County and I spend 1/3 of my time there. I would like to see no changes in hp regulations, merely enforcement of existing laws. This means no personal watercraft in the park. If changes must occur I suggest 60/40 hp below Jerktail and Eminence to Big Spring landing #2. Unlimited hp below that to the park boundary. Twenty five hp from Pulltite to Jerktail and Alley Spring to Eminence. This would simplify the zones and protect the upper river. No motors above Pulltite and Alley Spring. This simplification is easy to understand, and would preserve the upper reaches and lifestyle of the residents on both the upper and lower rivers. Scenario 'C' is the closest to this suggestion. There would be a no motor zone, small/medium zone, and unlimited motor zone. The Current below Big Spring is a major river.

On another note, existing laws must be enforced better. This means no personal watercraft, underage drinking, drug

use, illegal fishing, and especially litter control. It makes me sick the amount of trash I recover in my boat each week. If more funds are needed for manpower, charge an annual launch fee tag.

Thank you for your attention. I look forward to the meeting in Kirkwood next month.

Kenneth E. Kram, DMD

---

**Correspondence ID:** 54    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,13,2013 16:25:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have read all the documents and would like to recommend Plan A rather than Plan B. I have somewhere over 1500 miles behind me in a canoe. I first floated the Current River in 1966, just out of high school, from Baptist Camp to Round Spring. The river was pristine and beautiful. Very few people, if any, shared the river with my group of 12. I continued nearly every year on either the Current or the Jacks Fork and while leading my church high school youth group in 1973 we decided to have a camping and canoeing trip. Over the years I had noticed the water pollution in the form of suds at every riffle and root wad was getting worse. After the area officially became the Ozark National Scenic Riverways the area slowly became less polluted. I noticed the change and applauded the efforts that brought about cleaner water.

My concerns for the future fall into two main categories. First, I realize popularity brings people and while most people are respectful of Nature and other people there are some folks who just think they can do whatever they want and that's OK. There isn't much I haven't seen take place on the rivers and I'll be the first to say I don't want a police presence everywhere. There needs to be a way to educate people that the river system will be here for the future ONLY if EVERYONE takes care of it. Excessively loud and drunk people in camp sites are almost impossible to avoid and we need more Rangers on hand to remove them if they won't behave. I have witnessed people being removed. The entire camp site erupted in applause.

Second, I believe motor boats should be even more limited than they are currently. 40 horse power is way more than necessary to go upstream on virtually any part of either river. 40 horse power being limited to the lower reaches where the water is slower is further reason why it's too much. There is no possibility of enjoying the wild life or the peace and quiet of a morning mist in the sun rise if a motor boat is around. The thought of allowing motor boats further up stream in off peak times of the year is absolutely insane. That's some of the best time to see and hear nature and avoid the crowds. Different times of the year present different faces of the rivers and that's exactly why many people float different times of the year.

My youth group floated every year for 13 years. It was the high-light of the year and many of the kids came back when in college and helped lead the younger kids. It wasn't unusual to have 20 canoes. We ran into a very belligerent motor boater one year as we neared Two Rivers on the Current. He didn't want canoes on "his" river and tried his best to swamp as many of us as he could. He went up and down the river several times but was not successful. On his last pass the kids had had enough and blockaded the river. He pulled a shot gun and they let him by. They noted his description and boat number and we reported him to a Ranger at Two Rivers. The man was arrested. My point is this...Motor boats and canoes DO NOT MIX. There is no way of knowing the experience level of anybody that boat might encounter. Serious harm is possible.

I would like to float in the areas that allow motor boats currently but I will not do so. The disruption is not worth it. I stay up stream. Allowing motor boats will further restrict my enjoyment of the rivers.

Plan B will not help in the areas I feel strongly about. My sons grew up on those rivers and are in complete agreement. Plan A will restrict motor boats the most and that part of the plan should be implemented in Plan B at the very least. For those who feel the rivers are too crowded please consider that removal of motor boats might spread people out and reduce congestion.

Thank You. Good luck.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 55    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,13,2013 16:26:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My close family grew up in Ellington, and still lives their and has an ongoing tradition of camping on the river several times a year for the past 36 years. My family now lives in Indianapolis and we still drive to camp at Current River every year. We all respect the beauty of the nature at the river and look forward to meeting up here yearly to see family members. There are many generations who have took part in the tradition great

grandparents down to great grandchildren now. To keep carrying on the family tradition I am stating the NO ACTION PLAN, don't take Current River away from us!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 56    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,13,2013 19:37:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I favor alternative "A".  
Thanks,Don

---

**Correspondence ID:** 57    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,14,2013 07:55:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We prefer Alternative A. Motors above 10 HP should not be allowed on the ONSR above Van Buren.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 58    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,14,2013 08:20:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please, I'd like to know the justification for people motoring on the river at such excessive speeds. What's the hurry?  
What about "wilderness designation" includes the use of Jet Boats- the noise, the smell of exhaust, and the velocities? Where are they going? Is it an emergency?  
The river is 70 miles long from Akers Ferry to Big Springs. If someone was going 10 mph they could easily cover the river in a day.  
What's wrong with limiting to electric motors for fishermen, or even 10 hp for the whole river? The argument that jet boats stimulate the local economy is very weak. I would posit, by far, that canoers stimulate the local economy 10 times more.  
Can't we have just one river that is free of noise, air pollution, and yes, dangerous situations aka a drunk or a kid, behind the wheel of a 40 hp (yeah right...) boat?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 59    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,14,2013 08:39:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please implement the "No Action Plan". This area is extremely important to me and my family & friends. I have grown up on these river ways and I would like to be able to take my children there on day. I cannot express enough how much the memories I have made here mean to me and I hope that I will be allowed to continue to camp and enjoy this area. Please keep this area open to the public for camping and recreational use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 60    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,14,2013 12:56:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** While the new plan does close some undesignated trails that are damaging the local ecosystem, it also authorizes 35 miles of new horse trails with additional river crossings, as well as a new horse campground along Jacks Fork (which the Park Service itself admits would increase the likelihood for water quality degradation). This plan is supposed to revise an outdated 1984 version that has resulted in misuse and water pollution... but will it really do the trick? The hellbender, for one - - an amazing, ancient 2-foot-long salamander, the largest in North America - - deserves more.

This park gets so many visitors each year, I would hope more would be done to protect this park for future generations of people, native plants, and native animals.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 61    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,14,2013 12:58:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to comment on the National Park Service's draft management plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

Missouri's Ozark National Scenic Riverways covers an incredibly vast and beautiful landscape. Home to rare animals like the Ozark hellbender, rare crayfish and gray bats, Ozark National Scenic Riverways currently sees more than a million visitors a year.

As you no doubt know, the Ozark hellbender is an amazing, ancient 2-foot-long salamander that is the largest salamander in North America.

While the draft management plan does close some undesignated trails that are damaging the local ecosystem, it does not go far enough to protect this ecosystem and the magnificent wildlife that call it home.

Specifically, the draft management plan authorizes 35 miles of new horse trails with additional river crossings, as well as a new horse campground along Jacks Fork. This would substantially increase the likelihood for water quality degradation.

The draft is a good start, but it does not do enough to preserve this area for future generations to enjoy.

Thank you for your consideration and the opportunity to comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 62    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,14,2013 13:35:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The draft plan for management of Missouri's Ozark National Scenic Riverways, while successfully closing several trails that are damaging the local ecosystem, does not do nearly enough, and in fact opens the door for 35 miles of new horse trails with additional river crossings that will be detrimental to the water system. Additionally, the inclusion of a new horse campground along Jacks Fork will most likely lead to water quality degradation, which is exactly what this plan should be attempting to prevent.

Please rewrite the plan with water quality maintenance as a top priority.

Thank you,  
A. Nelson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 63    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,14,2013 14:16:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please- no more new horse trails and no new horse campground along Jacks Fork- the likelihood of water degradation is too great. Too much is at stake for water quality and species endangerment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 64    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,14,2013 15:01:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As with all of our wild public lands, I would encourage you to let it remain wild; for the properties we've acquired that have been badly desecrated by human activity simply let it regenerate over a period of 100-200 years, tweeking where necessary to get the land back to a more wild, pristine, virgin state.

In regards to the Ozark national scenic riverways, this should mean hiking,camping, canoeing, kayaking, tubing and similar minimalistic human activities are acceptable. Building of most structures, motorized vehicles, and most human activities should be banned or severely restricted.

Simply think what the area was like before Lewis & Clark era, then try to get the land to that state and keep it there.

Thank you for your consideration of my input.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 65    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,14,2013 17:32:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I suppose I would like a combination of A and B. I would like to see less mechanized boating and ATV use in the National Scenic Riverways. Both scare the wildlife in the immediate area. Motor boats can be a hazard to canoers and swimmers and honestly, if someone has to use a motor boat, there are plenty of area lakes that offer wide open spaces and plenty of fishing. I realize that ATVs are popular in this area, but I feel they destroy the national beauty with the tracks they leave behind and they frighten wildlife. I feel that most tourists to this area are getting away from mechanization and going back to nature and this area certainly offers it. There is nothing better than sitting in a canoe or flat bottom boat or on a quiet bank and hearing only the natural sounds the riverways offer.

I do have a problem with the horseback riding and have concerns about the droppings the horses leave behind. Plan B would expand the areas for them but I feel there are too many horses here anyway, especially with the concentration of them during the monthly trail rides. I worry about ground water pollution, pollution in the rivers where the riders cross and the health of those swimming in the rivers. I do not feel the trail riders contribute significantly to the local economy. If they did, there would be more economic development in the area. They help a minority of the general population here from my own observation. They have ridden their horses in town and leave horse droppings on the sidewalk and do not clean up after the horses. Locals do. If their horses are messing up the sidewalks here, imagine what they are doing to the rivers and groundwater around the horse camping area.

We moved here because it is a pristine area with lack of big commercial development. I hope it continues. I do appreciate the opportunity to express our viewpoint. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 66 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,14,2013 23:32:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am dismayed at the increasing numbers of threatened/endangered species. If we can save even one, such as the Ozark hellbender, at some inconvenience to humans, then that is the course we should take.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 67 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,15,2013 11:12:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support alternative A. "Emphasis would be placed on restoring natural resources to more natural conditions and limiting development." The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is one of the things that makes Missouri special, lets keep it that way now and in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 68 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,15,2013 12:56:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The current draft management plan is inadequate to protect endangered species such as the hellbender, rare bats and other species that call this area home. With over a million visitors each year, stronger steps need to be taken to ensure that water quality is not gradated by the 35 miles of new horse trails that are authorized in the current plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 69 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,15,2013 14:43:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to be put on record as supporting the no-action proposal. I am frequent floater,boater,camper of all boundaries of the current river,and would like no additional restrictions be put in place.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 70 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,15,2013 17:36:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the NPS preferred Alternative B with two exceptions. Motorboat horsepower from

Round Spring to Two Rivers on the Current River should be limited to 10 hp (peak season) and 25 hp (off-peak season) instead of 60/40 hp. Also, horsepower from Eminence to Two Rivers on the Jacks Fork should be limited to 25 hp instead of 60/40 hp.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 71 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,15,2013 19:13:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** For 30 years my wife and children have enjoyed the ONSR by canoeing the Current and Jack's Fork countless times, and for years backpacked the Ozark trail through the region. Now in our seventies with compromised knees and a bad shoulder my wife and I would no longer be able to enjoy the natural beauty of the ONSR if it were not for horseback riding. If by abolishing all illegal trails Alternative A would eliminate trails for horseback riding, the elderly and partially disabled would be denied access to the marvels of this ecosystem.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 72 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,15,2013 20:17:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Basically there are two ideas I want to submit :

The most valuable natural resource we will have this century is potable water. We must do everything we can to preserve and protect this national resource. Protecting our fresh water from pollution should be one of our nation's sacred duties to the future.

The second idea is that we need to :

It is time for the states and people of Earth to set aside some significant environmental reserves where people may visit but they may not remove, alter, or denigrate the environment. Such reserves provide a biological plant and animal reservoir against species loss and a safe place for nature to evolve without the rapacious human destruction witnessed around the globe.

Does the Management Plan accomplish these two goals and if not what can be done to protect water and the ecosystem to maintain animal and plant diversity from the threats of increased human populations ?

Thank You.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 73 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,16,2013 12:31:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support no action. I am concerned that the underlying goal of the NPS is to permanently make the park off limits to the public. ONSR is the leading source of enjoyment for the citizens of Carter County. NPS will harm the citizens of Carter County if it imposes any more restrictions on the river. It is time for the federal government to serve the public, not special interest groups who do not reside in the Ozarks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 74 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,17,2013 08:16:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I get an announcement now that the Adobe file is damaged and can not be repaired upon download. Earlier this week, I rec'd a note of IE problem (tried two downloads with the same result). Now today (11/17/2013) I get an Adobe file damage upon download. How do I get the document if you can't get the file/site fixed? Can't comment without document. If the new proposal works as well as your agency's document download, don't do anything!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 75 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208



**Received:** Nov,17,2013 13:28:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Ozark hellbender is going to have a heck of a time if a draft management plan for Missouri's Ozark National Scenic Riverways, recently released by the National Park Service, becomes final. The plan, now up for comments for the next 60 days, covers a vast, beautiful landscape that's home to rare animals like hellbenders, rare crayfish and gray bats - - and gets more than a million human visitors a year.

While the new plan does close some undesignated trails that are damaging the local ecosystem, it also authorizes 35 miles of new horse trails with additional river crossings, as well as a new horse campground along Jacks Fork (which the Park Service itself admits would increase the likelihood for water quality degradation). This plan is supposed to revise an outdated 1984 version that has resulted in misuse and water pollution... but will it really do the trick? The hellbender, for one - - an amazing, ancient 2-foot-long salamander, the largest in North America - - deserves more.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 76    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,17,2013 17:13:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** While the new plan does close some undesignated trails that are damaging the local ecosystem, it also authorizes 35 miles of new horse trails with additional river crossings, as well as a new horse campground along Jacks Fork (which the Park Service itself admits would increase the likelihood for water quality degradation). This plan is supposed to revise an outdated 1984 version that has resulted in misuse and water pollution... but it doesn't go far enough. The hellbender, for one - - an amazing, ancient 2-foot-long salamander, the largest in North America - - deserves more.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 77    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,18,2013 09:10:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** No action needed.  
Please leave it alone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 78    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,18,2013 16:10:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep this proposal out of Missouri.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 79    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,18,2013 16:48:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am strongly against NPS determine what trails we ride and which they want to close. Horsemen are also conservationist. We should be able to enjoy our public lands, since we help pay for them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 80    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,19,2013 07:27:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** why has this not been announced in the local newspapers affected by these proposed changes? I received notice from a friend who got it from a friend. This is public information and should be done by press release so all of the local public is informed. It appears to be intentionally only published to the minimum in an effort to minimize public opportunity to review it fully before the deadline.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 81    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,19,2013 08:19:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The file is corrupt and can not be downloaded by the directions shown. Where can I get a good copy?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 82    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,19,2013 08:19:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** After reading through these plans I feel that none of the changes are fair and that tax payers will be denied access to too many areas and that there will be too much control from the NPS. This will cause many communities to lose out on money generated from tourism and people will go other places. I feel that there should be no changes to the current plan. thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 83 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,19,2013 08:36:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please halt all motorized vehicle use in streams and trails with slopes that cause erosion into streams. Please continue to allow horseback riding in this area and stabilize trails and stream crossings to decrease negative impacts on the ecosystem. Perhaps you might consider creating a few stream crossings using techniques employed by the managers of the South Fork Recreation area in TN where they have installed concrete bars at stream crossings to reduce siltation and erosion. Please decrease motor size on boats to what is recommended and do not allow motorized boats in areas deemed too sensitive for their use.

Thank for considering my recommendations and comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 84 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,19,2013 09:11:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We have traveled to Missouri and Arkansas with our horses five times in the past 10 years to trail ride. With the high price of fuel and upkeep of the horses, we have chosen locations that are lower cost so we can continue traveling and trail riding. We have limited our visits to places in our own state and the neighboring state of Minnesota, because of the cost of trail passes!! It starts out small and increases every year. It would cost me five annual trail passes @\$20 and a park sticker of \$25 just to ride at a place 40 miles from home. It costs a similar amount if I ride in a park 70 miles away in Minnesota. It also costs similar amounts to ride in the two counties I live near. Add it up!! No one of modest finances (people with families to feed) can continue to pay that and still ride. Everyone wants to charge, and they state they will use the money to improve the trails, etc., but what happens is they make the trails so expensive that the local people who created them can no longer afford to ride on them. That is not the values this country was founded on. Whatever happened to the idea President Roosevelt had of creating a national park system that would be forever preserved and available to every American??? A quick visit to the Grand Canyon or Yellowstone will show you what happened to it. Greed! Those parks are totally over run by foreign visitors who can afford to visit them because they do not have to pay our property or income taxes to preserve them. Americans pay for them, everyone else enjoys them. Please do not make the same mistake other states have by instituting fees that then require more and more fees to hire more and more people to maintain and police trails that were once free.

Sincerely,

Anita, the taxpayer who can't afford to trail ride in her own state.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 85 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,19,2013 09:40:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please, make no changes to the existing rules regarding the availability of trail access in Missouri.

It is a very popular region for many outdoorsmen, especially those who enjoy riding their horses on the trails, and people travel many hours to camp and ride in that area.

By limiting access or closing trails, the NPS would not only give "local" residents fewer places to ride, but it would also provide less incentive for people to travel to the area.

That, in turn, will mean less money coming in. The trucks that pull those horse trailers utilize local businesses for fuel. The people camping use local businesses for food, camping and grocery supplies. They often buy hay for their horses once they arrive in their destination, rather than having to pack it in their trailer, so that also benefits the local farmers and feed store operators.

Limiting trail access, or closing trails, will cause many horsemen to find other places to ride and the businesses that rely on that income will suffer for it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 86 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,19,2013 09:40:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please leave the current plan in place with no changes. Horseback riders spend lots of money in these places and the economic result of closing trails to horses would be devastating to these communities. We come to these parks from all over the country to see these national treasures.

Horseback riders and trail riding organizations work with the park services to maintain trails for no charge as well as donate money toward trail system maintenance all over the country. ATV and mountain bikes cause as much if not more destruction than horses. We understand and want to protect these trails. We are also taxpayers!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 87 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,19,2013 10:10:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** So...I hear you all are trying to change things again. Well, this taxpayer would like to see things left as they are. We, the taxpayer already pay to enjoy this beautiful part of our country. I don't appreciate the idea that I should be banned from certain areas or charged a "fee" to ride. Us trail riders are some of the most careful people with this land because we do enjoy it and want it here for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 88 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,19,2013 10:33:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not change the regulations for the Ozark Scenic Waterways and Parks. We love this area just as it is and do not support any amendments to the rules that now exist. It is accessible to all people and various types of recreation, but still a beautiful park where one may experience nature. Please keep it the way it is.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 89 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,19,2013 11:02:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Do not get rid of horse trails. There are many people that benefit from them, and no harm comes to the environment from riding horses. If you want people to get outside and help preserve nature, you can't keep making regulations to make them stop enjoying the things they love to do outside.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 90 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,19,2013 11:15:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The proposals under this plan are not only infringing upon the rights of citizens but will hurt the local economy. People flock to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for recreation, thereby contributing to local campgrounds, restaurants, etc. In these tough economic times people do not have extra money for permits and passes to use areas that were established for recreational purposes to begin with so they will just stay home or find some place else to go for vacation.

The horse and mule built this country and should have access to the trails without restrictions. If it were not for horseback riders a lot of the trails would not even be open or accessible. The majority of equestrians value the trails systems available to us here in Missouri and we do everything possible to preserve the land.

We have too much government control in our lives now and we do not need more. Public land should be controlled

by the state in which it is located, not by bureaucrats in Washington DC.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 91    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,19,2013 11:35:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I want to comment on the proposed changes as it applies to the horse trails. I would like to suggest that if any horse trails are removed that they be replaced by trails with the same mileage, rather than decreasing the amount of riding available. There are so many places already where horses are not allowed that, as horse people, we need to advocate for trails to remain open to us. As my husband and I are elderly, we cannot hike like we used to and find that horses allow us to enjoy the natural beauty of this area. Please consider this when deciding on your changes.

Thank you.

Judy Spitzer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 92    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,19,2013 18:41:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This is to let you know I am against any changes in equestrian trails to national forests. My preference is to keep them as they are now. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 93    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,19,2013 19:21:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am not in favor of the proposed changes and would like to see the proposal as it currently is.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 94    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,19,2013 19:24:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like for everything to stay as they are now no closings just maintain what is in place or improve.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 95    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,19,2013 19:25:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am not in favor of any the proposed changes and request that things stay as they are. Don't fix something if it is not broken. Horse people spend thousands of dollars a year in that area and any changes would hurt the economy severely.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 96    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,20,2013 06:45:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It is my hope that Alternative A is the one the NPS chooses. These rivers are very scenic and have incredible water quality. To allow motorized traffic would adversely affect the water quality and would definitely detract from the floating experience one gets from paddling these rivers. Please select Alternative A for the future management of the ONSR.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 97    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,20,2013 08:30:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 11/20/13 \* \* GO BACK TO THE REGULATIONS BEFORE THE BOULDERS WERE INSTALLED \* \* \*

I filled out a comment card on the previous Draft General Management Plan.

At that time, my request was NO CHANGE. SINCE THAT TIME, the Park Service

has methodically closed access points by installing large boulders.

You are offering the NO CHANGE option on the new Draft General Management Plan, which would leave the Park Service regulations as they CURRENTLY ARE. What happened to the option of leaving the Park Service regulations as they PREVIOUSLY WERE ??????

---

**Correspondence ID:** 98    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,20,2013 08:40:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 11/20/13 HORSE TRAILS

The Draft General Management Plan includes the closure of approx. 65 miles of horse trails. The economy of Eminence, Missouri depends heavily on the tourist industry, which includes many trail rides.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways was established as a recreational park, not a wilderness or a limited-use area. Keep all the horse trails and access points open - in fact, create more horse trails in addition to those we already have. AND - reopen those that have been quietly closed in the interim.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 99    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,20,2013 08:52:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 11/20/13 \* \* \* \* \* BOAT MOTORS \* \* \* \* \*

We were given the option of NO CHANGE on the PREVIOUS proposed Draft General Management Plan, and that is what I selected on the provided Comment Card.

Now we have a new proposed Draft General Management Plan, with the option of NO CHANGE. However, if this option is selected, it means that the regulations will remain as THEY CURRENTLY ARE. Why don't we have the option of going back to the way the Park Service regulations were before they were changed to the proposed current regulations?

Please go back to the regulations on boat motors as they were before work started on the new Draft General Management Plan. This is a recreational park, not a wilderness or limited-use area. People enjoy using their boats on the Current & Jacks Fork Rivers. Many local businesses specialize in selling, customizing and repairing boats and motors. The new Plan will impact our enjoyment of the rivers and our economy.

The people who come to the Park infrequently should not dictate how the PEOPLE WHO LIVE HERE use OUR Park !

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 100    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,20,2013 09:01:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 11/20/13 \* \* \* \* \* OFF-ROAD VEHICLES INCLUDING ATVs and UTVs \* \* \* \* \*

The people who live close enough to enjoy the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers frequently want to be able to use their off-road vehicles to visit their favorite trails, woods, river crossings, etc.

Please go back to the regulations as they were BEFORE the "NO CHANGE" option in the new proposed Draft General Management Plan.

This is a recreational park, to be enjoyed by the local population, many of whom have lived here all their lives.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 101 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,20,2013 11:32:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My preference would be Alternative A. Restricting motorized crafts from terrorizing these waters is always a good idea.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 102 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,20,2013 15:41:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I visit Eminence Missouri at least one week a year. While riding in the adjoining areas there's one thing I'd love to see. We need signs saying when we're 50ft (or however far you want us) from the river. That way we can rest our horses and they'll probably poop then and not in the river. It's always so stressful and impossible to stop when your horse is pooping in the river. We don't want tickets, we don't want to add pollution. The reason most horses poop in the river is because that's where we stop to rest and it's the first chance they get to relax and go.

So if there's a sign and small clearing at the appropriate distance from the river on the trails that have river crossings it would be hugely appreciated. I've been thinking of this for years but never knew who to tell.

Thanks for taking the time to listen!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 103 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,20,2013 15:52:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly support the "No Action" proposal that would make NO CHANGES to the current operating system. "We the people" pay taxes that support these public lands and yet little by little restrictions and fees are being added and our rights are being taken away.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 104 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,20,2013 17:59:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I was alarmed to hear of this news. My husband and I have recently purchased property in Eminence along the Jacks Fork River. We have been riding these trails for 20 years and love the people, trails, and forest area. We have purchased property there and intend to spend our vacations and retire there in the next few years just to keep enjoying the trails and river. This is a small town with down to earth and hard working people that struggle to make ends meet on a daily basis and depend on tourism for their livelihood. By closing the river accesses and charging for people to ride the horse trails, you are taking food out of their mouths.

I'm sure the government feels they have legitimate reasons to impose their regulations at the cost of citizens, but honestly hasn't the government already taken enough.

This is the last thing this county needs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 105 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,21,2013 12:16:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate your public service in updating this plan. I ask that in the final plan, you protect Current River and Jacks Fork water quality, which would in turn protect the endangered Ozark hellbender and other

rare animals. Please do not add an additional horse campground or add more horse trails along the river. Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 106    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,21,2013 23:11:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo.

Nevertheless the Missouri Sierra Club believes Alternative B could be better. We recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads; Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings;Bars all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 107    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,21,2013 23:18:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** ATV's have become a very destructive force to our parks and waterways. I think most park enforcement personnel would love to limit their use in these areas, but unfortunately they are being curtailed by our legislators who fear losing votes from ATV enthusiasts. Please do the best you can to reduce the destruction caused by those who care nothing for saving these areas for future generations to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 108    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,21,2013 23:21:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Support Alternative A

---

**Correspondence ID:** 109    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 00:18:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Our Ozark rivers are a national treasure. We must put a high priority on protecting them. I have floated these magnificent streams for over 50 years and they have impacted my life in so many ways. Please protect these fragile ecosystems for the next generation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 110    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 00:29:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I heartily thank the National Park Service for the good work in preserving the beauty of the parks and waterways of the Ozarks. I have spent many weekends for many years enjoying the parks, the rivers and the natural beauty of Missouri's Ozarks. It saddens me to see such destruction of all the natural resources and sickens me to see added roads, litter and river crossings.

Please consider Alternative A as it offers more protection to these delicate areas. I know that tourism is critical to the economies of these small towns but there is only ONE Ozarks and it needs to be preserved. A few people losing their selfish individual rights to pollute, be noisy and uncaring of the natural beauty ruins the place for everyone. When I come down there and see people dropping trash, playing loud music and being rude, it makes me wonder why they even bother. They could be noisy and rude and raucous in a hotel room in Branson or somewhere else and leave the natural beauty quiet for those of us who truly respect it and come down there FOR the peace and quiet and communion with nature.

Perhaps I'm an old fuddy duddy but we only have one Mother Nature and we need to help her preserve her treasures.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 111    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as

recommended, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo. Nevertheless the Missouri Sierra Club believes Alternative B could be better. We recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:

Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;  
Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings;  
Bars all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

These rivers are so beautiful. I hate for them to be destroyed in any way.

Thank you for considering my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 112    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 01:33:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I ride trail motorcycles but there are plenty of places for me to do this without tearing up the riverbanks and forest....

---

**Correspondence ID:** 113    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 01:46:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** These precious resources must be protected in an increasingly populated state. Thanks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 114    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 02:16:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I've seen the beauty of those clear running rivers, the Current and Jacks Fork. My family stopped at a state park to gaze upon the waters and see the mill. Our visit was a gentle one. But the beauty of those rivers is also what draws many to them. To properly protect the rivers and let people enjoy them, please choose Alternative A for the sensible changes it contains like closing illegal roads and I designated horse trails.

Again, please opt for Alternative A to properly protect and manage the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 115    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo, but Alternative A would be better.

Alternative A is preferred as it provides additional protections for the rivers.

Of most importance, Alternative A:

Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;  
Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings;  
Bars all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

The strongest steps are needed as the much increased human use of these rivers has resulted in degradation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 116    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 04:00:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** First I would like to thank the National Park Service for developing the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan/Wilderness Study/EIS, and for knowing something must be done to actually protect this national treasure. The degradation that has already occurred must be reversed and those people interested only in immediate pleasure and are not interested in the future of the park must be stopped from committing their abuses. Although Alternative Plan "B" is an improvement, I feel it still allows room for those that would do harm to the park, an avenue for reckless behavior.



Please seriously reconsider Alternative Plan "A".

From contemplating the past and current abuses by public and business interests to the ONSR and the stated alternative plans of action, it is my opinion that the Alternative Plan "A" would be the best course of action to take.

My particular points of interest;

Close and repair all illegal accesses to the parks rivers, and enforce by law those closures.

No access to the park for any kind motorized vehicles except limited access to roads determined by the National Park Service.

Raise necessary numbers of employees to oversee and preserve the natural beauty and integrity of the park.

Restrict the numbers daily of the equestrian community and related businesses to lessen the damage done to the parks land and rivers. Allowing such numbers that requires warnings of unhealthy Escherichia coli (E. coli) bacteria levels in certain areas of the rivers should be considered unacceptable to everyone, including horse lovers.

Access to river gravel bars for day use or overnight camping by non-motorized boats and walk in only.

Thank you for your considerations.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	117	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Nov,22,2013 04:23:29
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I owned a plot of land in the Greenwood Forest for many years, and built a cabin on it, right next to the Jacks Fork River. It was beautiful! I spent many a weekend down there, hiking and floating. Do not let any person or corporation destroy the pristine beauty of Missouri's rural areas..
------------------------	--

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	118	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Nov,22,2013 04:37:50
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Thank you for your interest in and continued protection of the Ozark River Ways. The drafted Plan B appears to be the logical and principled ways to continue to protect the delicate environment and preserve the setting for future generations. We are campers and fish the Ozark streams. We look forward to many more years of bliss and enjoyment in a marvelous part of God's creation.
------------------------	--

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	119	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Nov,22,2013 04:45:26
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	It would sure be nice to preserve just a few things and places for our kids. The Ozark Scenic Way is a treasure worth preserving.
------------------------	---

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	120	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Nov,22,2013 04:47:34
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Don't ruin every thing on the planet! Could mars have once been like us?? If you say no how do u know this for sure??? James
------------------------	--

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	121	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Nov,22,2013 05:15:42
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	We should all care about our environment.We all need to protect it for us and generations to come.God created everything and we are all stewards to take care of everything.
------------------------	--

---

**Correspondence ID:** 122    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Thank you for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo.

However, I agree with the Missouri Sierra Club that Alternative B could be better. We recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:

Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;  
Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings;  
Bars all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

I know that it's difficult to balance access with conservation, but ATV traffic, mountain bikes and even excessive horse traffic can be a blight upon our natural areas, and I support stronger control of these activities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 123    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 06:18:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have floated and camped around the current and Jacks Fork for over 30 years and have concerns about degradation from ATV use and excessive horse pack use. Moderate individual horse use seems reasonable but large group tours may be too impactful and need to be kept to less vulnerable areas. ATV users ruin the floating and camping experience for all others with the noise and the vehicles cause significant damage. These should not be allowed and have their own areas away from scenic riverways where their impact will not disturb others or cause environmental degradation. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 124    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 06:29:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Why isn't the closure of the cabins and the lodge at Big Spring beginning in 2015 for at least three years not mentioned in the GMP?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 125    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 06:33:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been canoeing on the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers for 30 years and well appreciate it's pristine beauty. I am happy so many more folks like it so much - but it must be protected from over use. Too many horses and ATVs are present. This is a "Wild and Scenic River" system and needs our protection

---

**Correspondence ID:** 126    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 06:34:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers clean.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 127    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 06:34:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep these precious places clean and in tact.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 128    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 06:35:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe open access to horse and ATV's to be ruining our natural river ways. Please restrict access to these and other abusive means of destruction. Not only restrict them but patrol to see that rules are followed. Volunteers would help, I know. The age of "I can do anything anywhere" is OVER! Our natural beauty

must be FOUGHT for! People who buy horses and ATV then wonder where to ride them is not good citizens and their use of these should be curtailed- -by force!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 129    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 06:36:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** In this day and age of resource destruction and disregard for our waterways, our environment IT IS AN IMPERATIVE for the health and wellbeing to protect these these waterways.

Thank you for making the best decision to PROTECT not CAPITALIZE on this precious land in Missouri.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 130    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to thank the National Park Service for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo.

However, as a member of the Missouri Sierra Club I believe Alternative B doesnt go far enough as it relates to preservation.

I would recommend and support the adoption of Alternative A. This plan takes further steps to provide the following:

- Additional protections for the rivers
- Closing illegal roads
- Restoring natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads
- Closing 65 miles of undesignated horse trails
- Adding no new stream crossings
- Barring all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars

We will only get one opportunity to preserve with land for future generations.

Thank you!  
Carol

---

**Correspondence ID:** 131    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 06:42:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for your thoughtful analysis. I think alternative A is better- to close illegal roads, restoring 50 miles of these to natural conditions, & to close 65 miles of undesignated horse trails. No new stream crossings.  
Don't allow recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.  
We are lucky to have these beautiful areas & let's protect them for us & future generations.  
Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 132    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 06:55:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Our Rivers and streams need to be protected from polluters and this includes people and groups as well as huge pig farms and industry. Illegal roads and ATVs do enormous damage and allow more pollution and even illegal logging.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 133    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 06:57:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We don't have many nice rivers left and we need to protect the ones we have.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 134    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 07:07:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I ask that you withhold my personally identifiable information from public view.

I am encouraged that the National Park Service (NPS) has proposed an improved Draft General Management Plan for future of the Ozark National Scenic River ways management. I would remind the NPS that the main reason for creation of the National Scenic River ways is protection of this magnificent natural resource.

The Current and the Jacks' Fork rivers are truly wonderful natural areas that can be enjoyed in many ways. As population pressure, development, climate change, misuse, and competing usage increase, it is important for river management to increase protections from disruption and destruction.

I believe that Alternative B is an improvement in management that will help the Ozark National Scenic River ways. I believe that some additions that would improve protections should also be included.

I am concerned about misuse of ATV's and excessive horse traffic along the rivers and their destructive river crossings. I strongly urge the NPS to adopt those proposals in Alternative A that would better protect the rivers. Specifically, I believe that closing of 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and not adding any new stream crossings should be adopted in the management plan. I also believe that closure of 50 miles of illegal roads would be of huge benefit to the rivers and surrounding environment. I believe these roads should be restored to natural conditions to benefit both the river and the wildlife.

I personally find the jet boats on sections of the river to be disruptive. I realize their usage was a traditional use that continues to be allowed. I also realize that their allowance was important in gaining support of local residents. I also know that they are noisy, create heavy wakes and can easily carry cans and waste into the river. I have personally found that many locals have gradually increased their tendency to speed by canoes without slowing or yielding right of way. There will always be scofflaws and problems between motorized and non-motorized river traffic and I ask that the NPS will continue to work on this issue.

Thank you for improving the protections for the rivers and keeping their integrity and tranquility uppermost in your management plans.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 135    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 07:08:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Protect the environment!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 136    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 07:10:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I visited the Current river once, but it is a very beautiful river near the Mantuck Springs, nestled in the Ozarks near Salem MO. I am involved with the Green Party and I am against the pipeline due to much destruction to the wildlife and the environment. I cannot understand why "Man" needs to destroy everything for "his" wants. Angels hate humans!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 137    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 07:13:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** You STOLE land along these rivers; NOW take care of it !!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 138    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 07:13:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have floated in the Current and camped on Jacks Forks River. I recommend Alternative A to

the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft Management Plan because it best addresses the issues of illegal roads and prohibits RVs on gravel bars. I urge that we act to protect Missouri's natural areas so that future generations may enjoy their beauty.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 139    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 07:17:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** DO YOUR JOB and protect our natural waterways and the surrounding wilderness from assault by special interest groups.  
This our country- THE AMERICAN PEOPLE'S- it does not belong to the few who would damage and destroy. Missouri river wilderness must be kept clean, quiet and damage free for wildlife and all those who enjoy the outdoors, not just the disruptors.  
GET RID OF ATVs and recreational vehicles!!!!!!!!!!!!!!  
NO MORE ILLEGAL ROADS!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! HORSES OUT!!!!!!!!!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 140    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have enjoyed floating and fishing the Current and Jacks Fork rivers with my family most of my life and these natural treasures deserve protecting for future generations. I want to thank the National Park Service for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as recommended, would be a positive step forward from the status quo; however, Alternative B could be better. I would favor the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers (e.g. Close illegal roads and restore natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads; close 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and add no new stream crossings; bar all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars. Thank you for your consideration.

Philip Arnold  
Springfield, MO

---

**Correspondence ID:** 141    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 07:27:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for taking my comment. I have floated both rivers and I can tell you the erosion is decimating both rivers. Aquatic habitats are very sensitive. That's why I'm in favor of alternative A

---

**Correspondence ID:** 142    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thanks to the National Park Service for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis of the Ozark Scenic Riverways. Adopting Alternative B, as the National Park Service has recommended, would be a major positive step forward from the status quo.

However, on behalf of the Missouri Sierra Club, I urge you to improve Alternative B could be made better by providing additional protections for the rivers, as outlined in your Alternative A. The latter would close illegal roads and restore natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads; and also close 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings; finally, it would bar all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 143    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 07:28:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the National Park Service for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo.  
I have enjoyed many float trips on the Current and Jacks Forks Rivers! I want to see them protected and restored so

they look more like they did when God created them.  
Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 144    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 07:44:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm in favor of making NO changes (especially by the national government). The less jurisdiction you have over Missouri's natural resources the better as far as I'm concerned. You really ticked me off when you closed accesses during the govt. shutdown. We all know why this was done, because we know how your bread gets buttered.

Why could I not take my canoe out of the river at Cataract landing? It was my understanding this access was closed by you. I NEVER have seen a park employee there. Remove the trash can and leave us alone! We had to go to the Meramec River that week, and Carter Co. and their concessionaires lost potential revenue because of you. You messed with people's livelihood!

You're thinking about adding more horse access to the NPS? Seriously? How about less? Or better yet, leave that alone too. You'll only screw that up! I really "like" how Mr. Black wants to raise the camping fees so you're not competing with the "privates". I'll bet THEY love this idea. What's to keep them from immediately raising their prices after you raise yours? They offer more amenities anyway, so their prices should be higher. Typical government idea- --stupid! It's probably just a "fig leaf" after he screwed with their finances during the govt. shutdown.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 145    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 07:49:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would highly recommend that all horse activity on both the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers be eliminated, especially the horse activity on the Jacks Fork River just east of Eminence, MO. I have been on the Jacks Fork River several times east of Eminence seeing horse feces floating down the River.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 146    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 07:50:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We must begin to be proactive in our protection of our lands and rivers. If we do nothing we will regret our inaction as our children and grandchildren will regret it!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 147    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 07:51:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am 76 years old and my family had a cabin at Ebb and Flow until the National Park Service took it over. Until it became a National Riverway it was a pristine area with no problems. Now that it have been advertised all over the country it is nothing like it once was. The Rivers need to be protected from horses, ATV's and motorcycles. You have been given the responsibility of keeping the rivers clean and wild, so please do your job.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 148    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thanks to everyone at the National Park Service for putting in all the hard work to develop this draft General Management Plan! My family did a 3 day float trip on the Current River this past July, and I did hiking trail maintenance with the Sierra Club near the Current River this past October, so I am a regular visitor to ONSR.

While the preferred alternative B would be a major improvement over the present conditions in the park, I would recommend that the NPS adopt alternative A because it provides stronger protection for the park in several critical areas, including:

1. Unauthorized horse trails - alternative A would not create any additional stream crossings for horses, and would add 10 fewer miles of new horse trails than alternative B would do.
2. Undesignated roads - Alternative A would restore an additional 5 miles of road back to natural conditions.
3. Horsepower limits - alternative A provides stronger protections against big horsepower boats, which are not compatible with canoeists and tubers who also use the river.
4. Hiking trails - alternative A provides for 5 more miles of new hiking trail than alternative B does. As a volunteer who has done trail maintenance along the Current River, I think there are great opportunities for expanding hiking options in ONSR.

Thanks in advance for your attention on this!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 149    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 07:56:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the proposal on Alternative B. This is much better than the status quo, but I believe Alternative A would be more effective in preserving these lands for our future generations

---

**Correspondence ID:** 150    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 08:07:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** help protect our rivers from the misuse of ATVs and illegal roads!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 151    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 08:10:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for putting together a thoughtful analysis of the Ozark National Scenic Riverway. Your proposed draft for management of the Riverway is an improvement over the current situation.

However, I urge you to consider Alternative A as opposed to Alternative B. Alternative A provides more protection for the Current and Jacks Forks Rivers. Not only are they natural treasures, they also provide recreational and tourist opportunities which will only be enhanced with greater protection.

Thank you for considering my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 152    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 08:13:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Unauthorized roads and horse trails need to be closed up. D not allow motor boats.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 153    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 08:14:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Protect the Current and Jacks river.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 154    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 08:23:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to thank you for your analysis.

I would like to see you adopt alternative A and close illegal roads and restore the natural conditions to those illegal roads. I would also like to see illegal horse trails and stream crossings closed. There should be no access for ATVs in the river and gravel bars.

Thanks so much,

Claus Wawrzinek

---

**Correspondence ID:** 155    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 08:33:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please adopt option A. Water is the most important asset on the planet and the giver of all life. We should do everything we can to protect it. As a Missourian, I love and cherish our state's natural beauty. I come from a long line of Missourians all coming from Southern Missouri and protection of our rivers and lands was passed down along my family for generations. We cannot allow greed, mismanagement, reckless behavior, to spoil one of our state treasures. Please protect the Current and Jacks Fork for generations to come. They are truly National treasures and we all deserve to enjoy them in a sustainable and pristine manner.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 156    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I thank the National Park Service for putting together a well done analysis. Alternative B would be a big positive step forward from the status quo. I do believe the adoption of Alternative A would be better as it provides additional protections for the rivers. These additional protections in Alternative A are very important such as:

- â€C Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;
- â€C Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings;
- â€C Bars all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 157    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 08:44:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo. Nevertheless the Missouri Sierra Club believes Alternative B could be better. We recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 158    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 08:47:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Alternate B provides preferred protection to help keep the areas "natural" while allowing good choices for recreation.

I strongly support this alternate.

Thanks for your work!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 159    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 08:53:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect our rivers, parks, and forests.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 160    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 09:10:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It has been my privilege to live alongside the beautiful Jack's Fork River for the last 30 years. I love it, every riffle and pool of it, with a depth and passion that defies description. It is an entity that exists for its own sake; not simply to serve the public as a recreational venue.

We owe this river our very strongest level of protection. We do not owe the horses, we certainly do not owe the atvs,



we do not owe the roaring power-boats, & we do not owe the drunken crowds of loud, littering, destructive humans the right to desecrate this treasure.

Therefore, after considerable thought, I support Plan A. Somewhere in this bright land of ours, there must be places where we can show our respect in peace.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 161 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 09:12:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please stop the usage of ATVs and overuse of horse traffic, and illegal roads along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers.  
These practices are damaging the rivers, polluting them for the wildlife, and making floating the rivers unpeaceful and unpleasant.

Sincerely,  
Maureen Hoessle

---

**Correspondence ID:** 162 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service officials,

As a Missouri resident and member of the Sierra Club and many other environmental protection organizations, I want to thank you for preparing a comprehensive and thoughtful analysis for the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, including protections for the Current and Jacks Forks Rivers.

In your report, the National Park Service recommends adopting Alternative B from among the three alternatives presented under the NPS Draft Management Plan. I also believe that adopting Alternative B would be a positive step forward from the status quo.

However, the Missouri Sierra Club believes that Alternative B could be even better in several ways. The Sierra Club recommends the adoption of Alternative A because it provides ADDITIONAL protections for the Current and Jacks Forks Rivers. Of greatest importance, Alternative A accomplishes three things: 1) it closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads; 2) it closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings; and 3) it bars all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

As a Missouri resident, I have personally enjoyed this natural/scenic area of Missouri. I have also canoed down the Current River as well.

Thank you for your work regarding this important environmental issue. And thank you for considering my letter.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 163 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thanks for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as National Park Service recommends, would be a big positive step over the present strategy. However, I would prefer adoption of Alternative a for the following reasons:

Alternative A closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;  
Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings;  
Bars all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

I have good memories of canoe trips on the Jacks Forks/Current and the beautiful MO landscape where they are located. I hope they can be protected to a maximum extent to keep them wild and unspoiled.

- -Sheri Snyder

---

**Correspondence ID:** 164    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 09:32:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

I have reviewed the two alternatives for the Ozark Senic Rivers Management Plan. I believe that Alternative A is the better choice for these river areas. In my opinion, the greater protection for these beautiful river areas that Alternative A provides is better. I think it is very important to close the illegal roads and stream crossings to preserve this area. It is also important to keep recreational vehicles out of contact with gravel bars, which exposes the rivers to pollution.

Thank you for creating these two alternative proposals. Both are an improvement over the current situation, but I really think that Alternative A is the better choice.

Sincerely

Deor Braun

---

**Correspondence ID:** 165    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 09:32:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** These two rivers are so incredibly beautiful. We don't have much of that left. Please protect them. We don't need another Meramec river.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 166    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 09:38:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I urge you to adopt Alternative A to best protect our Scenic Rivers. It would: Close illegal roads and restore natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads; Close 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings; bar all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 167    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 09:38:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to thank the National Park Service for taking steps to protect the OSNR. However, I would urge the adoption of Alternative A with additional protections against illegal roads, undesignated horse trails, and recreational vehicles on gravel bars.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 168    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 09:48:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Close illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads; Close 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings; Bar all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 169    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 10:01:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a person who like to enjoy the wilderness and have hiked many miles in the Missouri wilderness and it upsets me to see the damage done in wilderness area by vehicles. The United States and Missouri have lost too much wilderness area to date. I also have hiked many trails in Missouri and have been please with great pleasure in the hikes and so hope not to see any disturbance when I go for a hike.

Sincerely  
Donald Bauer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 170    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 10:02:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Sir or Madam,  
I have been a canoeist in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways since 1972. I have seen much devastation from the horse trails that have been created since then. I hope the future of the Jacks Fork and Current River does not allow the horses to continue crossing the river and making more trails. I know that nothing stays the same, but the rivers have not been the same since all the horse trails have been created. I want the management plan that was drafted to include Alternative A instead of Alternative B. This will make sure there are no more horse trails added to the riverways. Thank you for your time and concern.  
Sincerely,  
Joe Dittrich

---

**Correspondence ID:** 171    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 10:07:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Current River and Jack's Fork river and surrounding area is one of the most beautiful natural areas in Missouri. It should be preserved and protected as much as possible for wildlife as well as the enjoyment of future generations of people. Kerry Starr

---

**Correspondence ID:** 172    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 10:09:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** First let me thank you for developing this plan. I have been an avid "floater" in the Ozarks since childhood and continue to enjoy it. I agree that plan B is a good choice but personally feel that Plan A would provide more river oriented experiences with closing of illegal roads and decreasing the horse traffic (I also love horses so mixed feelings) that tends to degrade trails as volume goes up.  
My vote is for plan A to provide the best river experiences there are other places to horseback ride and motorized vehicles deteriorate the trails and impact everyone within hearing.  
Thanks for all the effort you put into this

---

**Correspondence ID:** 173    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 10:10:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family and I have enjoyed canoeing on both the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 174    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 10:31:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** P.S.  
I was not happy when my three favorite access roads to the River were closed. I'm a caretaker, after all: a watershed protector. Couldn't see how i was doing any harm by driving down the hills to the gravel bars. Maybe I wasn't. But somebody was, because we started seeing major erosion.  
A road is a road, and if it's there it's going to be used by one and all.  
Debi Larson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 175    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 10:33:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family and I have enjoyed kayaking on the Currant and Jacks Fork rivers for 18 years. These waterways are treasures, and I hope to keep them clean and beautiful for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 176    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,22,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you to the National Park Service for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo.

Nevertheless, the Missouri Sierra Club believes Alternative B could be better. We recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:

Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;

Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings;

Bars all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 177 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,22,2013 10:41:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This is one of the most beautiful rivers not only in Missouri but in the country! Please keep it clean and unpolluted so people can enjoy it!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 178 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,22,2013 10:42:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a professional ecologist and I am writing to recommend Alternative A. It does the best job of closing illegal roads and undesignated horse trails, keeping recreational vehicles off gravel bars, and adding no new stream crossings. These rivers are a real treasure to the state of Missouri. The last time I floated them I was on a three-day camping trip and the second day was hours of thunderstorms. It was the most awe-inspiring, majestic demonstration of the power of nature and the wildness of the area you can possibly imagine. I was absolutely transported, and not just by my canoe! There have to be other places for people who want to use recreational vehicles to go, and keeping horses out of the river will help to keep it from being contaminated by e. coli and prevent erosion of stream banks at crossings.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 179 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,22,2013 10:45:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I do not believe in limiting activities for anyone in our parks system, but some limitations are necessary for keeping our few river ways pristine. No new access for horse or ATVs is one way. I have floated rivers in the Ozark National Riverways system and had the peace and quiet of the afternoon interrupted by ATV traffic.

I have noticed at certain times the year, the waters are not as clear. More unsettled sediment making the water murky. It is bad enough that as we float, we can see on the bottom sunken beverage cans and other litter left by canoeists without also having to deal with surface pollution.

Lets not become as some third world countries where we can't even go into the water for fear of disease and pollution contamination. We in Missouri are very fortunate to enjoy river ways that are still natural and protected.

Lets keep them that way by allowing the parks department to better monitor and manage their use.

Robin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 180 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,22,2013 10:46:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** please save

---

**Correspondence ID:** 181 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,22,2013 10:51:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We have kayaked the beautiful, pristine waters of the Ozarks National Scenic Waterways for several years and consider their safety, beauty, and undeveloped wildness essential to both the health of the humans who enjoy them, but the whole geography of this part of the planet. One cannot underestimate their value. They must be protected against degradation of all types including logging, agribusiness, golf courses (and their run-off), development and other things. Our national parks are the model for the world. They must be treasured, maintained and preserved ALWAYS!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 182 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,22,2013 11:00:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** These rivers are our treasures of Missouri. We must protect them and presevere them in as natural a condition as possible. They are to be enjoyed by Missouri residents. The income from tourists from elsewhere contributes to our state economy. As the Meramec was threatened in the mid 70's, all our rivers and streams will be threatened in some way and we must be committed to defend and preserve them as time passes. These are the heritage of our children and grand children.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 183 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,22,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to thank the National Park Service for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo. However, I believe Alternative B could be better. Alternative A provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:

Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;

Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings;

Bars all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

I have floated and camped on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers over many years and know how important these areas are to the natural beauty and ecology of our state and the region. However, these areas are delicate and need protection from overuse and misuse as so many people visit these areas throughout each year.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 184 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,22,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** A big "Thank You!" to the National Park Service for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis.

Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo. Nevertheless I agree with the Missouri Sierra Club that believes that Alternative B could be improved.

Instead, I recommend the adoption of Alternative A, as it provides additional protections for the rivers.

Of most importance, Alternative A:

- Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;

- Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings; and

- Bars all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

I have hiked and canoed in and around creeks and rivers over the years, and the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers should be protected.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 185 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,22,2013 11:37:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I taught in High School for 6 years and Middle School for 13 years, mainly in History or Geography areas. Part of the most interesting additions to our curriculum was the portions dealing with our environment and our influence on it. My students were always fascinated with the field work that we did with field trips, tours sponsored by the Illinois State Geological Survey. These rolling field trips encompassed not only physical geography but also our society's influence on it. Both the positive and the negative contributions for these actions.

The way these students' eyes lit up when they recognized what society was doing to our environment was spectacular to observe as they saw what things we were doing would affect our descendants. This, and the 30 years I then spent after teaching working as an administrator at a local Parks and Recreation Department helped me continue this work in a way that I know was positive.

I remember seeing our streams and rivers with 4 wheel drive and other vehicles in them, tearing up the rivers and steams. This damage, and litter does great damage to our environment. I remember one trip where were shown landfills that were located right in the middle of a major drainage area and the leaching chemicals polluting the water supplies of towns below that landfill. On the same tour we observed a hillside where a contractor had gone in and graded it, causing the shale under it to start slipping, causing the subdivision with some foundations and basements already poured to be abandoned.

We cannot allow this damage to continue. Please regulate this destruction of our environment. It is us, and our descendants who will suffer otherwise.

Thank you for your concern.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 186 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 11:49:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alternative A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 187 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 12:01:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Alternative A would be my choice. I'm for giving maximum protections to these rivers.

Here in Missouri we have an excellent Department of Conservation, however, schools seem to fall short on education in basic field biology/ecology. I'm convinced this is the reason the public, both rural and urban, has so little respect, knowledge or sensitivity to Missouri's extraordinary natural environment. The thinking seems to be, getting outdoors is such a virtue, any kind of treatment of nature is okay. All too often recreation becomes wreck-reation, if you give it an inch, it will take a mile. Being forward-thinking is to be pro-active. Don't let wreck-reation get a foothold. Missouri's scenic rivers are our greatest natural asset here. Please give them the maximum protections they deserve.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 188 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B would be a big, positive step forward from the status quo. Nevertheless Alternative B could be better. I recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:

Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;  
Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings;  
Bars all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

My family spent our first 'camp' at Round Springs, way back when it was still owned by a farmer. And I am sure he

laughed all the way home when we set up camp right next to the Spring. Boy! was it cold that night even tho' it was August! We learned our lesson and moved camp the next day. We also lost the cantaloupe and honeydew melon that we had put into the stream to keep cold for breakfast the next morning to raccoons.

Needless to say, this area of Missouri holds many memories for the remainder of my family, and we still visit the areas, even tho' we are not able to sleep on the ground anymore!

Keep up the good work you do and, I thank you for doing it!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 189    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 12:59:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep the rivers as is.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 190    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 13:05:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please preserve and protect our missouri natural heritage, scenic rivers. Jacks fork is one of the most pristine river ways, and is a natural place of peace and tranquility. Think Muir and Roosevelt. Sincerely, S. Trent

---

**Correspondence ID:** 191    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 13:09:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect the Ozark National Scenic Riverways as much as possible. I enjoy these rivers and want them to stay pristine. Water is the most valuable gift we have as humans and protecting aquatic ecosystems that keep our water healthy and vibrant should be our greatest priority. Healthy aquatic ecosystems provide so much to us and need the highest protection possible.

---

I am a representative from Students for a Sustainable Future, a campus group at Missouri State University in Springfield. Our membership is 30 students and we are united in our concern for healthy rivers. We collect trash every float trip we take and we use the rivers to simply canoe along and enjoy the scenery. We want this experience to be possible far into the future for everyone.

Please protect our Ozark Scenic Riverways.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 192    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 13:28:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I floated the Ozark National River when it was still in pristine condition and it is a national treasure. I understand that it has been badly abused by overuse and bankside caamping. Controls need to be put in place to control this abuse, and preserve its pristine qualities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 193    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 13:59:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thanks for your efforts to turn things around; however, I believe option A is the best choice for these beautiful rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 194    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service,

Thank you putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis for your Draft General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

While your recommended alternative, Alternative B, is a big improvement over the status quo, I believe that Alternative A is superior. It creates additional protections for the Current and Jacks Fork rivers.

This is why the Park Service should adopt Alternative A:

Alternative A closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of the roads.

Alternative A closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings.

Alternative A bars all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

Please fulfill the mission of the Park Service and these national riverways - adopt and implement Alternative A.

Thank you.

Michael Berg

---

**Correspondence ID:** 195 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 14:45:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
Re: care of water

Missouri and all states/areas water systems  
Need better stewardship and protection. Water is becoming  
clearly our # one human need and most valuable asset. Keep waterways clean for future generations . . . Lest we  
perish from the earth.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 196 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The National Park Service put together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting  
Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo.  
Nevertheless the Missouri Sierra Club believes Alternative B could be better. We recommend the adoption of  
Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:  
Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;  
Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings;  
Bars all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 197 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 15:43:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** as a tax payer and outdoor person..i DO NOT want atv's or horse's polluting our beautiful  
waterways (jack forks or current rivers) and should be prohibited nesr these treasure's of missouri...thanks bob reilly

---

**Correspondence ID:** 198 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 16:49:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I floated this rivers as a kid and young adult. I support all proposed safeguards for these areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 199 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 16:58:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form



**Correspondence:** I am a now 67 year-old man that spent many hours floating both these rivers forty years ago. I will never forget the satisfaction I had while reeling in a small mouth bass or goggle eye perch on my ultralight rod and reel outfit.

It is a sin against nature to allow a few bikers and others to permanently destroy the beauty and excitement of these streams. Please ban these machines from the rivers, and enforce the ban through stiff fines and/or jail sentences.

Thank you letting me speak out about this.  
Jim

---

**Correspondence ID:** 200 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 17:19:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Weve spent many happy hours on those two rivers when younger and hope that generations to come will have the same opportunity.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 201 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 17:28:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Urge the adoption of Alternative A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 202 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 17:39:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have canoed the Jacks Fork and camped on the Current and believe they should remain as pristine as possible. Motorized vehicles and boats should not be allowed around, in, or in the vicinity of either river and cattle and horses should be refrained from coming near them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 203 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo.  
â€œNevertheless the Missouri Sierra Club believes Alternative B could be better. We recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:  
â€œCloses illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;  
â€œCloses 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings;  
â€œBars all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars

---

**Correspondence ID:** 204 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 18:10:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'd like to see these rivers protected and kept clean. Too much vehicle and horse traffic leads to excessive pollution. The rivers also need more protection from drunken misbehavior. We see many beer cans on the bottom of the river as well as other garbage when we float.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 205 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 20:16:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect these beautiful waterways. They are vital to wildlife, tourism and the people who live there. The loss of any affects migrating birds and animals of every sort. We need water but not by exterminating other living things to acquire it. Help us protect this important parts of our world and community.

Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 206 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,22,2013 20:48:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think this is a great proposal. Missourians love their rivers and want to see them protected.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 207 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 21:11:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect the Current River & Jack's Fork rivers from too much traffic, ATV use, overfishing, etc.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 208 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 22:23:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Do please

---

**Correspondence ID:** 209 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 23:12:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Current and Jacks Fork Rivers were designated America's first National Scenic Riverways in 1964. They are an economic asset as well as features of our state that should be kept in as good a condition as possible to be passed on to future generations.

The National Park Service has done good work, and I appreciate that. To continue in the best way, please adopt Alternative A. Alternative B is a step in the right direction, but I hope you won't settle for less when Alternative A would be even better.

I know you try to do what is right, and I thank you for that.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 210 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,23,2013 00:17:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The beauty, natural health and access to all should be a apriority, not loud, polluting machines and careless use of what little unsullied nature is still in existence.

Sr. Renee Brinker

---

**Correspondence ID:** 211 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,23,2013 08:12:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect our MO waterways from agricultural and roadway pollution for wildlife, fishing, and recreational use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 212 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,23,2013 09:07:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It is my hope that we keep the Ozark National Scenic Riverways as pristine as possible. Most all of us drive vehicles on a daily basis and are surrounded by modern human activity and its trappings. We must have a retreat from this for ourselves as well as future generations.

Sincerely,

Clifford F. Schmid

---

**Correspondence ID:** 213 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,23,2013 09:08:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support River Management Plan A.

I appreciate that the Park service recognizes the need to develop a management plan for our Ozark Scenic Rivers, the Current and Jacks Fork. My wife and I have been frequent canoeists on the Ozark riverways for the past 30 years making anywhere from 3 to 10 trips each year. Over those years we have seen the degradation particularly to the Current which we float more frequently usually in the stretches between Baptist Camp and Two Rivers. Twenty years ago we would go on 4 day summer trips with our kids, camp on the gravel bars and have pristine, private, and secure experiences. However, with increased road access to the river, you cannot find a gravel bar that is not covered with tracks, trash, human excrement and fire scars. Three times in the past 10 years, we've been set up to camp on gravel bars and had pickups drive on to the gravel bar and set up for a loud party. I don't begrudge people that experience, partying on the river is fun. Its just that with the current non-management plan, it can happen anywhere at any time.

The Wild and Scenic Rivers plan is intended both to make more natural wilderness experiences possible for people and to preserve the flora and fauna of the river in a more undisturbed state. I believe that River Management Plan A would restore those qualities to the river experience. I recognize that there would be resistance from people who have enjoyed and profited from the environmental abuse of the Current and Jacks Fork rivers. However, they have options to go to other Ozark streams that are not designated Wild and Scenic.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 214 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,23,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service,

Thank you for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo. Nevertheless the Missouri Sierra Club believes Alternative B could be better. We recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings; bars all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Bryna Pizzo

---

**Correspondence ID:** 215 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,23,2013 12:19:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe that Alternative B would be a good step forward, however, I would prefer Alternative A since it closes illegal roads, undesignated horse trails and bars recreational vehicles from gravel bars.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 216 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,23,2013 12:43:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I haven't been on the Current myself for many years but my experience 20 years ago is one of my best memories. A video a friend produced recently reminds me of what a great resource the river is and I believe everything we need to do to protect it as a natural resource should be done.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 217 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,23,2013 12:44:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Save these rivers. I have canoed there and it is beautiful country. Keep it clean for our children.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 218 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,23,2013 13:37:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

I live on the East bank of the Current River just north of Van Buren, Missouri. As someone who has enjoyed fishing on both the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers for years, I would like to make clear that I support the NPS choosing the No-action Alternative.

All of the proposed plans restrict access to the rivers for boaters. The false belief that this river system is in anyway under threat due to the use of boats can be proven false by the pristine condition of the river currently.

The area's residents and businesses receive considerable income and pleasure from the access that recreational boating provides. These same residents pick up trash and aid tourists year round making the parks more enjoyable for all.

These suggested changes to the management plan purpose a solution to a nonexistent problem. To be clear, the rivers themselves are not overcrowded, or polluted. The ecosystem supports incredibly healthy and expanding populations of wildlife too numerous to list. There are more bald eagles, beaver, otters, and fish every year and we look forward to the area supporting the recently reintroduced elk population.

Please believe me when I say that the people living in this region care deeply for this wilderness area and do not seek to damage it in anyway. We want it to be more pristine for our children than it is now and endeavor to make sure that it will be.

It seems that there is a movement to restrict boat motors in parks because some people believe that they "must" cause damage. I concede that cutting roads through the forest is certainly something that would change and potentially damage it. However, it is quite a leap to claim that a small boat floating on top of the river creates any more damage than a slight wake. It should be especially noted here that this river system has multiple natural yearly rises of ten feet or better that change the river infinitely more than any human activity on it could ever hope to.

The idea that sportsmen/women using small boats on a river will damage it is akin to claiming that walking along the Appalachian Trail will increase the rate of erosion of the mountain chain itself. In reality, a trail it must be traveled if it is to be maintained. I maintain that the public use of the river by concerned and interested citizens guarantees its preservation in its present pristine condition for generations to come.

Thanks for listening  
Allen Edmison

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	219	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,23,2013 14:25:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** thank you for protecting the stunningly beautiful Current River and Jacks Fork River for future generations to enjoy. please enact Alternative A to protect these wonderlands as greatly as possible. our family has spent many happy hours in this area and hope that our children's children will also be able to do so.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	220	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,23,2013 16:02:37				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Thanks for the analysis. I support the adoption of alternative A. We must do all we can to protect and preserve our rivers for ourselves and our children. There are so few places left for folks to experience the wonder and beauty. There are plenty of other places for horses and ATVs. We do not want the pristine disturbed by illegal roads and unauthorized uses. Thanks again.

V/r,  
Bill Kloeckner

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	221	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,23,2013 20:35:50				

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Spent many years floating and camping on the Current and Jacks Fork river. I have traveled all over our country and have never seen any place more natural or beautiful than these streams.

I visited these rivers for most of three decades in the 70's, 80's and 90's. Floated with small groups of a few up to 200 with the Real Estate League of St Louis. These are not places for motorized vehicles, riding trails and drinking parties. We need to get these areas back to peaceful and enjoyable family areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 222 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,23,2013 23:56:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for your efforts to protect and preserve the Jacks Forks and Current Rivers as part of the Ozarks National Scenic Riverways. I have gone on canoe trips down the Jacks Forks and Current Rivers several times and enjoy the natural beauty that both rivers offer. However, I have noticed an increase in the number of illegal roads and undesignated horse trails, including undesignated stream crossings; these along with recreational vehicle access to gravel bars have begun to deteriorate the natural beauty and the scenic quality of the river. I hope you will consider closing all illegal roads and undesignated horse trails and restoring them to their natural state, as well as banning the gravel bar access of recreational vehicles in an effort to preserve the scenic and natural qualities of the rivers. Thank you again for your efforts to protect and preserve the Ozarks National Scenic Riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 223 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,24,2013 06:33:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for your attention to the Current and Jacks Forks rivers. Any protection of these beautiful resources is appreciated. I personally would like to see proposal A adopted.

Thank you,

Laura Harris

---

**Correspondence ID:** 224 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,24,2013 09:34:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It is my belief that we should protect this valuable natural resource to the best of our ability while making it available for the public to enjoy in a manner that doesn't endanger the resources health. Plan A would be my choice of the proposed plans. Thank you for the opportunity to have input.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 225 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,24,2013 10:58:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It appears you are unilaterally punishing the equine industry. We already have to travel sometimes hundreds of miles just to enjoy nature. We respect nature as much or more than those who walk, and we definitely respect it more than those who bike or use 4-wheelers. We have 4-wheelers but if I have to choose who can use the trails, it would be the horse.

The horse MADE this country! Without them you wouldn't even HAVE these areas for people to enjoy. Without horses the country wouldn't be half the size it is.

Horses are part of history, and to eliminate us being able to traverse the trails along with hikers, and cross the rivers the same as hikers, is unbelievable.

Then we get to taxes. Our taxes pay for this as much as any hiker/biker. Probably more, because most of us have farms and get taxes out the gazoo!

There needs to be a meeting of the minds with environmentalists but we know that will never happen with extremists, and they are the ones usually greasing the wheel, not the moderates. the realists.

This is my opinion, and not the opinion of my club. I will see if I can get an 'official' response from the club and I will send that forward.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 226    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,24,2013 13:25:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Concerning the analysis you did on the Currents and Jack Fork Rivers, Both alternatives are an improvement, but I like A better because it closes horse trails and illegal roads, and keeps recreational vehicles out of the water.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 227    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,24,2013 14:05:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service

I agree with the comments from the Missouri Sierra Club. They support sensible guidelines that will protect the character of this national treasure, and allow it's enjoyment by people with the least damage possible.

As they have said, Alternative B would be a big improvement, but Alternative A will give the rivers more much needed protection. Limiting and restoring damage from roads, horse trails and ATV's is key. I know there is much public and commercial pressure to continue bad practices that have been allowed to flourish, but without enforced and strict rules, these rivers won't be scenic or biologically healthy.

I am grateful for the experiences I have had canoeing and hiking along these rivers through the years. I treasured the calm and naturalness where I found it, and did my best to preserve it while I was there.

I'm sure you love these areas too and want to protect them.

Sincerely, Dee Dokken

---

**Correspondence ID:** 228    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,24,2013 14:30:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Just want to express a preference for alternative A. I have floated & hiked in the area many times. It is such a beautiful area in Missouri that is important to preserve.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 229    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,24,2013 14:34:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is such a beautiful & important area to preserve in every way possible for Missouri. I favor alternative A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 230    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,24,2013 14:35:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Alternative B is a step in the right direction but these exceptional floating rivers would be much better protected from pollution and other degradation by Alternative A, which I prefer.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 231    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,24,2013 17:03:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please restrict the use of ATV's and horses in the Current and Jack's Fork River areas. We must protect these areas to keep them as 'wild' as possible. Areas where people can get away from the noise and pressures of what has become daily life are very important for the physical and mental health of the people. The destruction caused by overuse or improper use needs to be stopped before the entire area is ruined forever.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 232 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,24,2013 18:38:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My mothers family was all born and raised on Current river,I have relatives buried all up and down the river in different cemeteries.To get to some of them you have to use 4X4's, ATV's or boats.So the no alternative action should be the only option.To have people other than locales should not be allowed to have any say or vote on the plans.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 233 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,24,2013 18:53:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family (currently 12) come to the Jack Fork Area specifically the Cross Country Trail Ride. My grandchildren ages 7-2 talk about our vacation all year long. It is the only vacation we go on and enjoy camping and taking our horses. We are very concerned about the environment and take care not to do anything to endanger it. We handle our horse waste properly and never leave anything on the trail. To close down more trails and restrict river access would be a shame. I know that we spend several thousand dollars in the area stores and restaurants in just this two week period. We grocery shop, buy school jeans and boots, and assorted other things. You are going to take away the reason that so many people come to this area to camp. If you are concerned put your park people on horses on the trails and actually stop the few folks that are causing the problem. Thanks for your time.....

---

**Correspondence ID:** 234 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,24,2013 19:25:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Because of historical uses and the economics that have arose around the Ozark Nat. Scenic Riverways, the accesses,roadway accesses and other traditional uses should be maintained as is. Years ago, NPS stated they would maintain the traditional accesses and uses of the river as they had been used in the past.

For these reasons, I wish for the river accesses, remote trail accesses, horse trails, traditional river crossings, the use of outboard motors on the river to be maintained at the current level.  
Russell Schmidt

---

**Correspondence ID:** 235 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,24,2013 19:49:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a mother, former educator and now business owner, I ask the National Park officials involved in determining the future of our Ozark Waterways to have the foresight and courage to take a stand for our rivers and all of the people, animals and species who cannot pay their leaders to vote to protect them and help us sustain our world. Please - make the choice that is right for both NOW and the Future. Be Bold and Brave. Have the wisdom to redefine refine abundance. Let the new definition include the wisdom to honor and protect the elements which sustain our lives. If not you, then who? If not now then when?

Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Sylvia Donnelly

---

**Correspondence ID:** 236 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,24,2013 23:05:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect our rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 237 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,25,2013 07:46:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please continue to protect the Current and Jacks Fork rivers to the fullest extent possible.

Thank You.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 238 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,25,2013 07:52:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** AS A SMALL BUSINESS OWNER IN VAN BUREN MO. AND AS A CITIZEN OF CARTER COUNTY(4TH GENERATION) I FIND THE NEWEST PLANS FOR THE NPS TO BE A BIT RIDICULOUS. I HAVE ALWAYS BEEN A SUPPORTER OF THE PARK SERVICE BUT I FIND THIS HARDER TO DO EVERYDAY. I COULD RANT FOR HOURS ON THIS SUBJECT BUT AT THIS TIME WOULD JUST LIKE TO LET IT BE KNOWN THAT I DO NOT SUPPORT WHAT YOU ARE TRYING TO DO TO OUR AREA. I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW THAT MY SON WILL HAVE THE SAME OPPORTUNITIES TO HUNT FISH AND BOAT ON OUR RIVER.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 239 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,25,2013 08:42:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To Whom it may concern,

The information I have read on the trail riding along the Ozark Riverways

which would include Shannon County needs to be given back to the State. We

live in a State that has many trails in which we enjoy riding our horses. We

litter or veer off the trail provided. The State of Illinois has been out

doing this State even has a Dept that maintains the trails to keep people

like us wanting to visit their State. To put such restrictions on riders

that live here is NOT FAIR!!!

I cannot be attend the meeting in Van Buren, but please note that WE care

as citizen of this State, we want to enjoy the riding here as much as we do

in other States.

Thank You,

David and Starla Wagster

---

**Correspondence ID:** 240 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,25,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo.

Nevertheless the Missouri Sierra Club believes Alternative B could be better. We recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A: Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads; Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings; Bars all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 241 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208



**Received:** Nov,25,2013 10:42:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please consider the A Alternative for adoption. My family and I have been canoeing the Jack's Fork River for almost thirty years. It is truly a natural gem that deserves protection. Horses. Unless you have seen a herd of horses descend a river bank and cross the river at an undesignated spot it is hard to imagine the permanent damage that it does to an area. Every year large groups of riders do exactly that and in the process introduce large amounts of fecal material to an otherwise pristine waterway. I ride and love horses. This is not an anti-horse tirade. There is a place for large groups of riders to enjoy the outdoors together but we don't have to damage a natural resource to do it.

Four-wheelers. If you have ever enjoyed the peace and quiet of the outdoors with your spouse and children in a remote area only to be interrupted by the noise and activities of four-wheelers illegally entering the gravel bar areas then you would understand my concerns. Currently the rules provide enough loopholes that the drivers always claim to be legal. Loud,drinking drivers racing vehicles through a make shift gravel bar camp site is incompatible with what the riverway should be. I understand that there are complaints about drinking and canoes. We go in the early spring season specifically to avoid that problem only to encounter the four-wheelers. It is time to take control of the wonderful resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 242 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,25,2013 12:00:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly support the "No Action" proposal that would make no changes to the current operating system. We are trail riders and use the trails in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I think it would be a huge disservice to all those that enjoy the area to put on the restrictions and make the changes that are being proposed. I know as far as trail riding goes, this area brings in a lot of out of state people who not only enjoy the area but spend money in our state. Closing trails and placing restrictions would just cause them to go to our neighboring states like Illinois, Arkansas, Oklahoma, etc.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 243 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,25,2013 14:07:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We presently use Current and Jacks Fork rivers and land to float, camp, fish, hike all areas of park. What a wonderful resource. I have been using Current River since 1950's. I have seen many changes; mostly good; but of particular concern is the rapidly increasing usage levels. What use to be 'absorbable' by the river environment is not now. Shear numbers of people and the activities associated bring devastating impacts that don't heal thus bring detonating experience levels and devalue the whole park system. In particular:

1) Too many and too high horse power boats running too high up river causing bank erosion, noise pollution, oil contamination, generally negative experience for those using the river in a way more befitting it's natural state. Not saying ban but MANAGE for a change.

2) Too many horses and/or trails that clearly cut river banks, change shoals, dump higher levels of contaminates in river.

3) Need to control human impact of shear high numbers of floaters leaving human waste, trash, fire damage, irreverent activity and non civil or even criminal activity. Beyond education and enforcement some suggestions might be:

A) using park livery system to track violators and restrict or limit return use of park resources. If someone gets a ticket or is 'cited' for non punishable 'offense' they should have to endure some reuse restrictions.

B) begin mandatory use of fire trays and portable waste systems for campers in non designated camp areas. In use in Western US river systems and seems to have good compliance. Or at least provide designated bathroom points.

Human waste is high on list of negative impact activities to the river quality.

C) increase enforcement presence either thru rangers, mdc or sheriff.

Additional input:

1) As stated in your introductions, the spring system for the rivers is like none other. In addition to the above comments I think special emphasis should be provided to study all the major springs, create base lines of volume, morphology, water quality and then monitor. What is more critical to the future of the river.

2) Regarding 'GAPS' where Park service doesn't have control, provide more public notice to negative impacts and take legal routes where justifiable to seek change/compliance to reduce negative environmental impact.

We see what popular awareness and sheer numbers of people has done to negatively impact the river at this stage. It can't heal itself any longer. It will only get worse. Therefore more restrictive (we support the most restrictive use plan) measure should be implemented now. If we hope to have this great treasure even in its present form, which is surely not an original state, then we must take the most protective steps available.

Thanks for allowing for my input!

Riverman 65

---

**Correspondence ID:** 244 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,25,2013 14:46:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to go on record as favoring Alternative B of the Draft General Management Plan. Both plans A and B are very good and much better than the status quo (No action alternative) and certainly better than C. Alternative C allows for too much development and crowding, and would result in a much degraded experience for the park visitor seeking a more pristine and natural park setting for which ONSR is well renowned.

Alternative A is actually preferable in respect to river usage rules as it reduces the horsepower allowed, or eliminates motorized boating altogether, in critical areas such as below Eminence and below Round Spring,(all the other plans are far too liberal in that respect-including B) but B seems overall to accomplish more of the unmet needs of the park such as more planned trail linkages with the Ozark Trail,a restarted oral history program, and the proposed opening of a visitor and learning center at Powder Mill. The reopening of the long-shuttered Akers Ferry Campground called for in Alternative B is also long overdue and would once again allow visitors coming to experience the upper Riverways a convenient place to camp. Allowing some highly regulated horseback camping to be conducted as proposed in Alternative B seems fair as well as long as restrictions are obeyed.

The NPS recommendation to designate most of the Big Springs Wilderness Study Area to be officially designated as Wilderness by Congress in both alternatives is very desirable as well.

Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 245 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,25,2013 15:32:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The beauty and wonder of the Jacks's Fork and Current Rivers's color, space and aroma are magic. Since my childhood, I have lived nearby and enjoyed these rivers and spaces as often as possible.

Floating the waters and exploring the many caves and springs with friends and family has been a joy.

Sincerely,  
Michele

---

**Correspondence ID:** 246 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,25,2013 17:26:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please protect the Jacks Fork River and the Current River in Missouri. Excessive ATV 's in the area can cause erosion and other bi-products that endanger the river. I also ask that you closely monitor the number of horse trails and traffic in that area. We have been floating these rivers since we were in our teens. The beauty and clean water in these rivers are worth protecting. I would ask that you choose option A as I feel it affords safeguards that could further protect and preserve the area and it's rivers. I do appreciate the NPS and their efforts at maintaining a quality park experience for citizens.

Kind Regards,  
Laurel

---

**Correspondence ID:** 247    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,25,2013 17:31:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I do not think your proposal is best for the community or the area of Eminence, MO. We have camped and horseback ride at the Jack Forks river for years and our ancestors and settlers have also used that river. Now you want to shut down crossings and tell people they cannot use it? That will not only hurt the area, but will take away all the beauty and natural resource that bring so many of us to the area. Please do not take that away from us and what makes Shannon county such a wonderful area to visit for us that are tourist to the area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 248    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,25,2013 18:16:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not change any usage of the Park. We love this park just the way it is. We visit there once a year, and enjoy using it, from horseback riding to boating. STOP saving "our" lands, and let this generation, now living use it!

Who are you saving it for????

We are so tired of Green Peace and Tree huggers, who live in large cities, making rules for us, and the parks near our homes. There is so much wilderness, set aside, with no travel or use. And no one is out there!!! Wonder why??

This Mission statement is right off the governments' web page:

"to maintain the health, diversity and productivity of the nation's forests and grasslands to meet the needs of present and future generations"

Let us use the Land,

Larry and Geri Gustafson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 249    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,25,2013 18:18:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Closing certain access points, banning all gas engines, implementing Heritage Centers/Museum(s)/Interpretive Centers, crack down on polluters and litterers, severely limit off road vehicles. Prosecute any and all who do not play by the rules.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 250    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,26,2013 06:50:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My comment is concerning the draft management plan of our rivers, the Current and Jacks Fork. I am very much against this "plan!" These rivers DO NOT belong to the government. These rivers belong to the people who live here. Our families were forced to give up these farms years ago. They were promised to be able to stay here and use the rivers. What happened to that promise?

We now know how the Indian Nation felt when the white man came along and took their property. This is the exact same principal. The government came in years ago and took property for nearly nothing.

My family were the Broadfoots. My family was told, "anytime you want to come here, you're welcome to do so."

Where is that promise? This river belongs to us, the people who live here. We have taken good care of our rivers for centuries. I cannot say the same about the park service.

This is an oligarchy!!! We should have rights too!! Do we live in a nation where the ones with the most money has all the rights? We are tax paying citizens and this IS a crime! Politics should not be the rule!! You have NO right to change this policy!! You should be held accountable for your actions!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 251    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,26,2013 08:03:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for a thoughtful analysis. I support adopting Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers by:

\* closing illegal roads and restoring natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads

- \* closing 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adding no new stream crossings
- \* barring all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars

I've been lucky enough to spend time paddling on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. I, like many others, want them to remain healthy. Alternative A would eliminate human-caused sources of degradation. If left unchecked, the roads, horse trails, stream crossings and recreational vehicles will continue to spoil the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 252    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,26,2013 09:55:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect our rivers from overuse!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 253    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,26,2013 11:11:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect this river system to the fullest extent of the law and make the law as strict as possible. Give an ATV (even more so than a horse) an inch and they will take a mile. I am not against a variety of recreational use but this needs to be done in respectful manners. NO more water crossings and the closing of trails will do nothing to impede pleasure yet retain this resource for generations to come. Education is the key.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 254    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,26,2013 11:51:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have only been visiting the Jacks Fork and Current river area for 3 years but I visit several times a year. From a customer perspective I appreciate the job that the PS provides in enforcing the existing rules on the waterways. The result is a clean family friendly river. I also trail ride on horseback. Again I love the way things are. The river seems to flood at least once a year sometimes several times a year. It looks like a new river to be explored every time.

As a taxpayer I am totally against any more proposed spending! The alternatives A, B, and C do not list what all of the new things will cost. The costs has to be considered and should be the top consideration. Additionally the financial losses to the surrounding are considered but are described vaguely. The financial losses need to be better defined.

Alternatives A, B and C also introduce a new permitting system for horseback riders. I am adamantly against being regulated to ride my horse on a park where I am already paying substantial taxes to support.

I know people who have been coming to Eminence to ride for more than 40 years. The river and the surrounding areas look great to me. the only plan that will continue to provide my friends and I the same level of recreation as the past is the current system of less regulation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 255    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,26,2013 16:11:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been floating and camping on the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers for 20 years. I agree with the limiting of horse trails and prohibiting ATVs on gravel bars. During a 20 mile trip on the Jack's Fork two years ago, every gravel bar we stopped on had the smell of horse manure. It was impossible to get away from it. It was the first time I noticed this level of pervasive stench.

I always carry hydrogen peroxide now on each trip because any crack or split in your hands or nails will get infected due to the fecal chloroform count being so high in the water.

Four wheel ATVs have made gravel bars too accessible. There is no private camping. Groups of motorized vehicles can invade a campsite at anytime night or day.

Just a few years ago these rivers were a completely different experience. Let's get back to why these rivers were

protected in the first place. To keep them wild.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 256    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,26,2013 20:24:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Current/Jacks Fork National Senic Riverways is a beautiful area that needs protection from ATV's and roads. It needs to stay as a "senic" area, which will not be possible with too much "traffic". Last time I was there I saw damage from these vehiculer disturbances!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 257    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,26,2013 20:51:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The NSR needs to have a plan in which it has a little of an environmental impact as possible while maintaining all of the park's area in its native condition. All native species should be maintained or reintroduced if they have been extirpated (elk, red wolf).

---

**Correspondence ID:** 258    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,27,2013 09:08:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Current and Eleven Point Rivers were so very important to the early settlement of Arkansas. They're also very important today to our tourism industry and local recreation as well. They are among the very few locations on Earth to provide a home to the endangered Ozark Hellbender.

It's very important that these rivers are presented in a pristine state. They are the gems of the Ozark rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 259    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,27,2013 09:43:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Within the DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDY and the National Park Service (NPS) preferred plan, Alternate B, it indicates that, "The NPS would pursue a rule-making to change the existing regulations to allow 60/40 horsepower motors." Is this a lay down and, if not, what is the likelihood of the NPS being granted the rule-making change?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 260    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,27,2013 10:17:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Regarding Alternate B (NPS Preferred), does the NPS have an estimate of how many motorized boats would be affected by the extension of the 60/40 horsepower limit to Gooseneck? Perhaps I missed it in the 534 page document, but can the NPS also speak to the rationale of limiting horsepower?

I purchased a larger boat and outboard engine in 2006 to avoid the crowds north of the Van Buren bridge. The Van Buren Gap just got a lot more crowded with the displaced larger boats and outboard engines. Perhaps a Grandfather Clause would be appropriate for those of us who already have larger outboard engines permitted by the current Plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 261    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,27,2013 12:03:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I hope Alternative Plan A will be adopted for the future management plan for the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers. Closing illegal roads to the river is important. I am also in favor of eliminating undesigned horse trails and stream crossings. I also want vehicles to be banned from the gravel bars.  
Thank you for your consideration of my position.  
Myra Scroggs

---

**Correspondence ID:** 262    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,27,2013 15:05:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please crack down on the destruction that is happening now. Adopt alternative A, the most restrictive measures now can save these waterways and their habitats. They can always be eased when things get better.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 263    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,27,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Support:

Round Springs Wilderness Area  
Doing away with illegal access points  
Reduction of horse trail crossings of Jacks Fork

Prohibit:

ALL outboard motors on entire lengths of Jacks Fork and Current rivers in keeping with ex-Secretary Salazar's memo about reduction of global warming emissions. Outboard motors, whether jet pump or prop driven, emit copious amounts of CO2 and, in addition, pose a hazard to kayakers, canoeists, and rafters.

Reminder;

These are NATIONAL scenic rivers and comments from folks in Van Buren and Eminence should be considered, but only as much as comments from users in St. Louis, Kansas City, my town of Columbia and such faraway places as Seattle and NYC.. Not only are these NATIONAL rivers, but attract international visitors from Europe. Visitors don't come to smell and view horses or horse dung and if they like outboard motors, I recommend Lake of the Ozarks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 264    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,27,2013 16:29:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Me and my family think it would be a huge disappointment to limit any kind of access to current river we all agree it is beautiful and has been kept that way with normal use so common sense would tell you that it can stay nice and still be enjoyed!!!!!!!!!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 265    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,28,2013 04:45:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Ok, the National park Service want Plan B. And it will erode in 15-20 years to look like Plan C.

Let's begin with Plan A (no six flags or roads to invite Disneyland seekers).  
Eventually the National Park Service will have Plan B as Plan A corrupts to B.  
The future is very long. Populations grow and migrate. In twenty years we wont recognize the plan adopted. Plan for it. Go Plan A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 266    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,28,2013 22:11:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am strongly in favor of increasing the protection of the Ozark waterways through the proposed General Management Plan, and support Option B for its enduring benefits and impact in preserving these areas. My support is based on personal experience with two similar major natural resource protection acts. The first pertains to Quetico-Superior National Forest. When I was 11 years old, I spent 10 remarkable days in an extensive

canoe trip in these pristine waters with my brother and his University of Illinois adventure group. Ten years later, in 1975, this area was struggling with overuse and misuse, problems with trash, and a diminution in the wilderness experience so many had enjoyed. The park service then imposed restrictions: requiring registration and regulating the number of users at any one time, becoming more strict on allowable food containers and carry-out waste requirements, and restricting camping to designated sites with fire grates. I initially felt affronted at these added restrictions that placed some limits on my access and freedom of use. However, when I returned in 1990 with our two young children, I was extremely appreciative of the management plan and its reasonable and appropriate restrictions. While I had to plan in advance to gain access to the waterways, the limited number of users allowed the relative isolation desired in such an experience, and the few encounters with other people were welcome. My initial disappointment at being restricted to designated camping sites quickly turned to appreciation for the long stretches of wild, pristine shoreline dotted by the occasional designated site. Without such restrictions, the entire shoreline would soon be devoid of underbrush and would look like a city park. These restrictions overall had no negative impact, and instead allowed me to share the same wilderness experience with my children that I have marveled at 25 years earlier.

The second experience was with Grand Teton National Park. I was initially annoyed with the required registration and the daily limit on users. Once I gained entrance after a two day wait, my annoyance was quickly replaced with appreciation. Again the scarcity of other humans and the effect of registration and site restrictions created a marvelous wilderness experience, because of these protections. Similar restrictions are needed to protect our beautiful waterways and the forests they run through for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 267    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,29,2013 06:08:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** After reading your proposal for the current and jack forks water area, I want to say stay the way it is now, NO CHANGES !! You have a great area there now don't spoil it with over thinking what is working now ! In this country now we have to many restrictions. The U.S. used to be the land of the free and the home of the brave. PLEASE NO CHANGES DO NOTHING !!!!! Paul Rank

---

**Correspondence ID:** 268    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,29,2013 14:13:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The only trail I see on any of the maps is the 'Ozark Trail' - where would the 25-45 miles of additional trails be located in the alternatives and what are the locations of the 65 miles of undesignated horse trails that would be closed??

Eminence provides a great opportunity for outdoor enthusiasts of all types. I understand the reasoning behind management; however, if the levels of danger are only during the peak use periods perhaps stringent rules/regulations are not required. To limit the number of people on the river, close trails that have been used for years, and other restrictions would damage the economy horribly in the little town of Eminence not to mention ruin the recreational enjoyment everyone returns to every year.

Enforcing stricter use of the environment and beauty God created would be like displaying fine china that is never to be used and therefore not enjoyed and used to its full potential.

Please reconsider - with the many years of use, the trails are in great shape and should be available to the public to enjoy for years to come along with the rivers.

I was informed by a representative of NPS: "In response to your question regarding horse trails, there have been no specific decisions made on the management of the horse trails. The final General Management Plan will provide broad guidance for management, but the specifics for designating additional horse trails will actually be carried out in a separate planning process and will have a separate opportunity for public input."

MMMm, really? Actually the plans do not appear to be very general but specific decisions. I have yet to receive a response to that comment.

How can there be 'no specific decisions' when the plans indicate a specific number when referring to miles of trails????

Please do not stop or strictly restrice the use of such beautiful resources!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 269    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,29,2013 20:31:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a former NPS employee and a retiree of the USFS. I am a frequent floater of the Buffalo National River. I would like development of national rivers to be limited. (alternative A) Power boats and atvs diminish the wild experience of those of us who rely on our paddles and the current to move us. There are plenty of tame rivers and National Forest trails to provide an outdoor experience to those who choose to go mechanical. Once you develop a recreation area, the public will expect the NPS to maintain it, even in times of meager budgets.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 270    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,30,2013 14:37:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing in strong support of Alternative A in the NPS's Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan. As a neighbor of the park and a regular user, I understand well what a treasure our Ozark riverways are. I have fished, hiked, and floated on rivers inside and outside of the NPS lands. On three trips this summer to the Current River, I was impressed as always by the beauty of the water, the steep valleys, and the rich animal and plant life. However, I was also disturbed by several factors:

- \* First, I was startled by the amount of trash we encountered throughout the upper length of the river.
- \* Second, I was concerned about the network of informal roads and trails we saw, which provided vehicular access to the river at undesignated points. The visitors who took advantage of these undesignated access points clearly contributed to the litter and stream bank degradation.
- \* Finally, I noted that at Cedargrove and Akers Ferry, the sanctioned streamside access could do more to mitigate the impact of visitors on the environment.

The riverways within the NPS lands are just a small fraction of the high-quality recreational waters in this region. I have also enjoyed time spent on the Meramec River, the Huzzah, and others. For those seeking easy access, motorsports, and higher-impact lodging and amenities, there are ample nearby opportunities. I hope that the NPS will opt to preserve these lands for minimal impact recreation and education.

Yours sincerely,

Jeffrey M. Zacks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 271    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,30,2013 15:45:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I urge you to decide on Alternative A. As a retired wildlife refuge manager located in a highly developed county of New York, I know firsthand how important nature experience is for human beings. I also know with the constant increase in human population that the wear-and-tear on wild areas is greater all the time. My own refuge tells me that, a wild area set aside for only "passive recreation": nature education, walking, snowshoeing and -skiing. Still, over the years, rare species of plants have been dug up or picked, habitat trampled, small animals taken, and non-native species introduced. In general I love people but they often do ignorant and disrespectful things.

Now in the case of Ozark Riverways, if you allow such activities as horseback riding, the destruction of habitat will come with it, particularly along streams and other waterways. Both people and horses in various ways will introduce invasive species. This brief example of horseback use is just the beginning...

Additionally, people sorely need quiet, peaceful experiences. Where can they get them in this day and age? Mostly in the out-of-doors, in the "back woods", at small wildlife refuges like mine and hopefully at Ozark National Scenic Waterways!

Ultimately, Alternative A does the best job for people and nature both.



Think hard about your choice. Of course, you should have public input. But ultimately you are the professional staff, and along with your experience and sound science it is up to you to make the best decision to prevent damage, to preserve these lands and waters for future generations - - of plants, animals and people!

Thanks for your consideration of my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 272    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,30,2013 16:09:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I grew up spending time at creeks, so I hate to see our MO streams polluted. I want to know they are being protected from pollution and cleaned up after they have sustained pollution. I also care about the fish that live in tm and the frogs that live by them.  
I think livestock production needs to be kept far enough from them so that the waste products they produce will not be able to pollute the streams and make them uninhabitable and unfit for human enjoyment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 273    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,01,2013 10:00:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** You guys are idiots! Way to much time on your hands. First you take our family's land in '64 and now you want to tell us how to use our river. I hope your "plan" fails miserably.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 274    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,01,2013 10:35:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alternative A.

It does so much to protect these rivers.

This includes: Closing illegal roads and restoring natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads.  
Closing 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings.  
Bars all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

These are all huge points in favor of Alternative A.

In the early 1970s I spent a good bit of time floating both of these rivers. I returned this year for the first time in almost 40 years. I was still impressed but noticed some degradation which I think Alternative A would go a long way in taking care of. These rivers are too good to lose and these changes would, again, help save them.

Thanks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 275    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,01,2013 19:39:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is one of the beautiful natural areas left and we need to preserve it. Beautiful area and deserve to be cleaned up and preserved. Been Kayaking there and it was beautiful.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 276    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,02,2013 06:11:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please afford the Current and Jack Forks rivers the highest of protections.  
The development of these river systems by construction, over use and often illegal atv use as well as the destructive highly erosive horse trails.  
Who wants to be paddling down the river and have horses come riding right past dropping feces in the water.  
In regard to atv's often these riders have the attitude that it is their right to ride wherever they please because their machines can go virtually anywhere.  
Stop the illegal land exchanges and building construction.

David Olson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 277 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,02,2013 07:32:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am opposed to the "preferred alternative". I'm not sure whose preference this is but it does not reflect the values traditions or customs of the local people. I prefer less regulation but at this time support the "no action" plan which is what the park has operated under for the last 20 years.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 278 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,02,2013 07:53:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As Missouri's natural areas come under more and more pressure, it's vital to have the strongest plan to protect them. Such a plan would close illegal roads and restore natural habitats, as well as protect areas liable to degradation from vehicles and horse riders. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways are some of Missouri's special natural places and the utmost care should be taken to preserve them. Thank you for your efforts to steward these areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 279 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,02,2013 10:40:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do everything possible to keep our beautiful Ozarks natural and clean. The Ozarks are truly God's country. I love to ride horses, canoe and fish and explore our waterways and lands. There's still so much history and being at peace and close to God here. I'm a wildlife rehabilitator and have held many wild babies and felt the awe and excitement of their beauty and intricateness. They need our protection as well. We all need to stand together and do what is right.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 280 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,02,2013 10:48:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As with any plan to change the ONSR, people will be voicing many different opinions; all knowing they have the best and only solution. However, as a native Shannon County resident, I have firsthand knowledge of Current and Jacks Fork rivers. I moved to Shannon County in 1969 at age ten. I am the sixth generation of my family to use these rivers and now have grandchildren that make the eighth generation to enjoy this wonderful area. I have heard the stories of floating logs to the mills, gigging with pine knots, wagons crossing the frozen rivers in winter, running moonshine and all of the others. Through the years, I have witnessed and experienced many changes to the rivers and that's why I believe the only option is the no-action alternative.

The main conflict appears to be between the people using the rivers. Canoeists, boaters, horse riders, hunters, bikers and hikers all have different agendas. To a hiker, seeing an atv cross a creek might be considered an abomination. Similarly, to the hunter it is a valid way to get to the game. The list of conflicts goes on and on and there is generally no middle ground. Canoeists don't want to see jet boats, hikers don't want to see atvs and some don't want to see people camping on gravel bars.

The primary question is whether locals should be restricted from doing the things they have done forever; things they learned from their parents and grandparents - just so someone that visits once a year can have a pristine experience.

I agree that many of the designated camping areas and canoe rental accesses can be overcrowded during the peak months. However, go to those same areas on a 'peak season' weekday and see just how few people utilize these same campgrounds and accesses. To restrict outboard motor usage to 'off-peak season' use is not a logical argument since most summer weekdays are 'off-peak'.

The impact to the 'environment' as a result of recreational use is minimal. I would argue that more 'damage' is done during a minimal flood than could ever happen as a result of horses, boats, atvs and camping combined. I have seen many smaller floods and several large ones (1973, ~1976 and 1993). Flooding is a natural phenomenon, but has a

major erosional impact to the environment, far more than the immediate impact of humans. From a pure 'environmental' argument, the park should build levees and place riprap along the banks to reduce the erosional impact of flooding.

Since there appears to be no middle ground, the Park Service is faced with the task of 'balancing' the usage of this national park. Should they side with the locals or lean towards total restriction? There is no way to make this decision without displeasing one side or the other. That is why I believe that the no-action alternative is the only solution. At least everyone is getting along together now.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 281    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,02,2013 13:46:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

My husband and I are strong supporters of the alternative A management plan. I have seen the problems associated with tubers, jet boats, and horses and I would like to have a more secluded wilderness experience when visiting the riverway. I in fact would like to see it managed with a permit system similar to the boundary waters canoe area. Any change to the current plan (other than alternative C) will be a benefit to those who visit the river for it's natural beauty rather than for drinking and debauchery. Thank you very much and I hope for some changes to park regulations soon.

Chelsea Coursey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 282    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,02,2013 14:12:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I absolutely suggest no change in the current management plan. I do not support the closing of any roads and stopping gravel bar camping in areas where people, especially families for generations, have and do camp by driving into the river, they should be allowed to camp there, this is their heritage.

I do suggest the park service put the trash pick up back at main launch/takeouts...such as jerktail. what a joke to remove the trash cans and then proclaim that you want to protect the environment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 283    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,02,2013 14:30:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** i want no change!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 284    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,02,2013 14:42:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No change to current plan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 285    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,02,2013 14:51:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support NO CHANGE.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 286    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,02,2013 17:44:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I fully appreciate the effort, dialogue and data collection that have contributed to the crafting of a draft Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. In reviewing the lengthy Plan, I am of the

opinion that Option A presents the best course for preserving the scenic beauty and recreational opportunities of the ONSR. I am an avid fly fisher, but also one who enjoys the quiet beauty of a day on the river with others - others who do not jettison their garbage into the river mid-float, who ride horses around, but not through, our rivers, and enjoy human laughter and conversation above the din of ORVs and other motorized vehicles that send the fish and every other animal for cover. Without the scenic beauty of this important Riverway, there is no reason for others to visit; it will remain an under-appreciated, dwindling asset.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 287    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,02,2013 20:35:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am glad your management plan process is about to produce a better vision for the Current & Jack's Fork Rivers. I was floating those rivers before they were designated Wild & Scenic. I watched the cabins and clear cuts recede and cheered the chance for solitude on the upper river parts and didn't mind an occasional "john" boat on the lower river. Horse flies could be avoided by a quick plunge into a pool.

Sadly, as you have managed my stream boats have gotten (jet) fast and loud. Easements seem to be ignored and that gravel bar I used to camp on now has a giant pickup truck and trailer sitting by the water's edge. Where the bars aren't occupied, the trails behind them are often now mush. Horse traffic churns up the gravel bar edges and pocks trails. Trail multi-use is fiction when some users leave fecal fall out and that affects stream quality as well.

Although plan B makes some moves in the right direction, I prefer a closer match to the terms Wild & Scenic. Isn't A a better choice?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 288    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,02,2013 22:32:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have floated the Current and the Jack's Fork multiple times over 45 years. It is a national treasure. The photos of horses in the rivers is upsetting. Getting cattle out of streams but allowing horses in doesn't make sense. Photos of the horse trail ride vendors' stables and parking lots from the air, make me think of my last trip to the Grand Canyon. The ride vendors at THAT national park are limited, and trails are marked and maintained, and policed. If we are going to try and accommodate different uses, we have to upgrade our guardianship of these remaining wild areas. There aren't really many places left wild. There are so many of us trampling around. I support more stringent guidelines and the manpower to protect the Riverway.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 289    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,03,2013 07:25:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the increased protections of Alternative A for management of the Ozark National Scenic River ways in Missouri.

These rivers and surrounding lands are a national treasure that is losing some of their value by not being better protected from misuse and overuse. Environmental factors, population, encroaching development, improper horse stalls and waste run off, violation of easements, undesignated horse trails and misuse by ATV's all combine to disrupt and despoil the habitat, enjoyment and serenity of the river ways.

I favor closure of undesignated ATV and horse trails that crisscross fragile areas and urge that they be closed to that type of traffic. Illegal roads allow for illegal timber cuts and access for harmful pursuits to occur undetected and they should also be closed. Easements must be enforced and no new roads constructed. Damaged areas must be restored, wildlife better protected and the values for which the river ways were established must be reclaimed.

I am thankful that Congress saw fit to protect these river ecosystems and I trust the NPS to manage them with that protection uppermost in their priorities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 290    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,03,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I thank the National Park Service for putting together a well-done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo. Nevertheless I and the Missouri Sierra Club believe Alternative B could be better. We recommend the adoption of Alternative A, as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:

Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;  
Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings;  
Bars all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.  
Please consider these ways to protect a vital and beautiful and much-cherished natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 291 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,03,2013 14:16:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am strongly in support of a stricter management of the Current & Jack's Fork Rivers. My family and I spend an average of two weekends a year on these rivers and have been surprised by the amount of horse traffic along the Jack's Fork, including an incident this Memorial Weekend when one person in our party was nearly run into by a rider crossing the river. The ATV noise along the rivers has also reduced the natural feel, and I can only imagine what damage is being done beyond the banks. A plan should be put in place designating any Horse & ATV trails and all others should be closed. The majority of the river should have a wild feel. Horseback Riding and ATV activities can take place away from the river, Canoeing cannot.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 292 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,03,2013 16:06:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please protect the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please use Plan A to return the Scenic Riverways to a more natural state. Less mechanical, tourists, and horse traffic.

Sincerely,  
Viana Stilwell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 293 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,03,2013 17:56:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I don't know why you would want to change the current regulations on the Missouri River ways. The current regulations that are in place are currently working. The rivers are clean and are enjoyed by both residents and tourists. The only reason you would want to change these regulations is in order to be able to charge people to use the waterways or for control. There is an old saying that if it ain't broke don't fix it. Therefore, leave our waterways alone. Keep the control in the hands of the people who use it. I am a Sportsman and I enjoy horseback riding and camping. I don't agree with a lot of regulation be it State or Federal if it's prime subject is control of something that should now and always be Free to enjoy.

Thank You.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 294 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,03,2013 19:57:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We've canoed down the Current River many times over the past 40 years. It is my favorite river in Missouri. We especially love the serenity and beauty experienced along the Current River. Most important the lack of development and human encroachment makes you feel like you're in a national park.

We have noticed more and more access points to the river, horse crossings, and even vehicles parked next to the river's edge. I do not believe these changes are in line with the national park status of the river and degrade the experience. Therefore, while the proposed plan B is a definite positive step for the Current River protection, I think more needs to be done. These new access points and encroachments need to be removed, or at least the most

damaging ones.

Please protect the greatest ozark rivers in Missouri and adapt a management plan that will ensure they remain worthy of national park status.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 295    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,03,2013 20:17:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have read all of the alternatives, and I think that I prefer the NO-ACTION PLAN as each alternative has several provisions that I don't agree with.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 296    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,03,2013 22:07:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Ozark National Scenic Riverways preserves the free-flowing Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, the surrounding resources, and the unique cultural heritage of the Ozark people.

Mr. Black please read what you wrote,(above) the park was put here to maintain the free-flowing water as the Ozark people were afraid of the river being dammed and making a lake. It was never the intent of the Park or the Ozark people of it becoming a Wilderness or shut down from local use.

Remember the local people let you in and they can force you out.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 297    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,04,2013 07:18:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to comment on your plan to change our river use. I am very much against this. The Jacks Fork and Current Rivers are not optional for change. These rivers belong to the people here. It is my opinion that you are overstepping your bounds, just like every other part of government.

Our families have played on these rivers for years. I want my grandchildren, and generations to come to have that same option. There is no problem with our rivers now, so there is no reason to change. Eminence and the surrounding towns depend on those rivers for the economy.

I am VERY MUCH against this!

Doris Ann Broadfoot Warren

---

**Correspondence ID:** 298    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,04,2013 15:41:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** keep all atv out ,keep the horse trails in,but no new ones, keep all logging roads to as few as possible.thank you .

---

**Correspondence ID:** 299    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,04,2013 19:47:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a mother, educator, businesswoman and human, I am urging you to take a stand for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Missouri is blessed to be home to some of the most pure and beautiful waterways in our country. These rivers provide homes to many unique aquatic animal and plant species, allow many residents to work in the tourist industry which helps sustain lives in an economically challenged region, provide many people with priceless experiences. Please have the courage and the wisdom to understand that you have an opportunity to help America redefine abundance. It's up to leaders like you to create a world where abundance is not only money, rather it is clean air, clean water, good food, good shelter, and good relationships.

Thank You.

Sincerely,  
Sylvia Donnelly

---

**Correspondence ID:** 300 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,04,2013 23:51:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I agree with the NPS plan except motorized limits should not be restricted below southern boundary of park north of Van Buren.

Limiting to 60/40 below Big Springs to park boundary is excessive limitation also as proposed in plan B. I own and operate a watercraft with a larger motor than a 60/40. I do not normally operate at full throttle, nor do other operators with slightly larger engines. When you operate a vessel with three or four occupants and a 60/40 you must operate at high to maximum RPM. If you operate with a higher horsepower engine, you will tend to operate at half throttle, which is nearly equal to the 60/40.

This example may explain, I own a Chevy Suburban, I do not operate at full throttle, requiring me to have a three cylinder engine operating at full throttle is not better than operating a 327 HP engine at 2,000 rpm cruise speed. I do not pollute the environment more, while operating at less noise.

Yet I possess the additional horsepower that is occasionally necessary to assist other boaters or floaters in need of assistance.

Jim Pearl

---

**Correspondence ID:** 301 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,05,2013 08:11:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We like Plan A because it does more to preserve and conserve this wonderful national/natural treasure farther into the future so that our children, grandchildren and maybe great-grandchildren may enjoy it! There are other Ozark river alternatives available for more intensive activities such as ATVing and horseback trail riding- -both of which are more destructive in practice than hiking and canoeing. There is so much invasiveness of the natural world as it is, so let's do the right thing to preserve and conserve this jewel for a long time to come.

Dave & Ann Redmon  
Ozark river lovers living in Kansas

---

**Correspondence ID:** 302 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,05,2013 08:39:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for your extensive research in the development of this management plan. After review of both alternatives, I post here today to suggest that alternative A be placed into effect so that the rivers are further protected. Missouri is known for its springs and many people from other states choose Missouri when thinking of where to have a outdoor vacation, let's not disappoint them or our citizens. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 303 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,05,2013 09:53:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** TEST COMMENT

---

**Correspondence ID:** 304 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,05,2013 10:57:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I just spent thirty minutes filling out this form It was not accepted and I was NOT given a

chance to make any correction (did NOT mark that I was a representative of the organization listed). All the more reason I fear that my friends are most probably right and that NPS has already made up its mind. The first clue might very well be that the NPS has a preferred option. The restrictions are unjustified. Especially the elimination of trails and outboard usage above Pulltite. I have gigged and fished that area for more than forty years. I am being deprived of my heritage and culture for NO listed reasons. For the past several years I have had an outboard on the Upper Current River Clean-up, and typically pick up more trash in my boat than the majority of the others combined on the same stretch.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 305    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,05,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Our organization was created to help preserve the best of Ozark culture. I have been gigging Upper Current River for more than forty years. We have hosted family, friends, fellow educators and church members at parties that included thirty plus people. We have introduced youth to the sport of their ancestors while educating them to their place and their responsible role in our environment. We have enabled the more elderly in our communities to relive treasured aspects of their past. All the while, we have had a significant impact on the economy. In the past thirty years, I have purchased five boats and motors just to fish this specific stretch that is now being threatened- -Pulltite and above. At all of these many gatherings, there were purchases of food, fuel and equipment. This unjustified action will have an extremely negative impact on the local economy. There has been NO evidence offered that the use of outboards on that stretch harm either the river or the riparian border is harmed by their use. There has been little evidence offered that their use significantly conflicts with other recreational use in the peak season and NO evidence it interferes in the off season. It appears to be simply one more example of unnecessary intrusion into our lives; one more instance of the NPS 's history of mismanagement of this waterway.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 306    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,05,2013 11:28:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Our river ways are a way of life for many in our areas. Local businesses thrive because of the river access in our remote rural areas. Taking our access points, trails, and gravel bars away is obscene. We people of these areas take great pride and great care of our riverways. It is one of the only places we can call Gods country! Many locals and tourists alike would not disagree that you cannot find a much more beautiful place than the Current river to camp, boat, and fish on. Most of us have grown up on the river and it would be a shame to not pass down it's heritage to future generations. There are much bigger problems that need resolved in this world than taking away access to Current river. Shutting it down will devastate our communities and how we survive. Please reconsider your actions for the sake of our communities future!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 307    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,05,2013 11:34:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Access points are being further restricted, again. One of the largest problems I have witnessed during the NPS management of this property is that more and more rules and restrictions are implemented but unfairly executed. As a user and often a worker on the river (hauled canoes for almost three decades) I have watched rangers spend hours at Akers and at Running River sitting and visiting while drunks were reported, trespassers were driving where they should not and maintenance was not being done. Glaring examples include the closing of Sinkin Creek in part because campers were staying there too long. People charged with the ability and power to carry fire arms actually told me (as a member of the Missouri Press) that campers were left there all summer, circumventing the rule of two weeks by campers telling them that they were a different group. I mean, if these law enforcement officers cannot write down a license plate number and a date and the follow up two weeks later- -regardless of who is sleeping in it or sitting by the fire- -it is actually scary that they are empowered to carry firearms. Another recent development is the apparent, and when asked- -confessed, belief that a college degree disables them from pulling trash from an overflowing barrel. I have four including a doctorate and as a school superintendent mopped up vomit if the occasion demanded. Another worrisome concern is that there is too little accountability. Though there are NO cleanups being conducted by the majority of canoe businesses, the Van Buren office seems to believe there are because the concessionaires say there are. One official even offered to show me the dates on paper, after admitting they themselves had never attended one. A move in the right direction was that Supt Black did attend the Lower Current River Clean-up this past summer. Such mismanagement is I believe a significant reason that usage is down



and the local economies are suffering.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	308	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,05,2013 12:37:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Why isn't there any mention of the extensive repair/maintenance/upgrades planned for the Big Spring Lodge and the Big Spring Cabins beginning in 2015, or earlier, in the General Management Plan. Especially since the shutdown will last at least three years.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	309	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,05,2013 13:02:55				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As someone who travels to your state to enjoy outdoor activities. Things should stay the same with no changes.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	310	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,05,2013 13:03:49				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please leave the forest alone and don't change anything. There are so many of us that use these trails to relax and get away from the daily grind and enjoy our horses. We all respect the rules of the forest and trails. Never leaving a trace behind except the memories of a great day.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	311	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,05,2013 13:14:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I would like to request NO CHANGE in policy....pls leave it as it stands now. Riding is historical along the river ways. Again NO changes.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	312	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,05,2013 13:18:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My husband and I like many others travel a good distance to ride and camp at Coldwater and Eminence on an annual basis. We Norman spend a week there and should the trails become less accessible we will likely spend our time and \$\$ in other locations. The change of trail access is likely to cause major financial losses to the community. Please do not change the trail access.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	313	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,05,2013 13:29:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please leave the Ozark National Riverways alone. If the right to enjoy the rivers, via horseback, or camping is taken away, there will likely be more trouble down the road. Mainly because, especially trail riding is something that a lot of young people enjoy, and there is no telling what kind of entertainment that they would wind up replacing a relaxing trail ride or camp out with, should that right be stolen from the Missourians.I mean what is next? Take all of the effort that you put into these types of annoying bills and aim it toward real problems. Thanks for letting me air my thoughts.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	314	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,05,2013 13:29:37				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	PLEASE no change				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	315	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,05,2013 13:38:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	NO CHANGE!!! LEAVE IT AS IS!!!!				

NO CHANGE!!! LEAVE IT AS IS!!!!  
NO CHANGE!!! LEAVE IT AS IS!!!!  
NO CHANGE!!! LEAVE IT AS IS!!!!  
NO CHANGE!!! LEAVE IT AS IS!!!!  
NO CHANGE!!! LEAVE IT AS IS!!!!  
NO CHANGE!!! LEAVE IT AS IS!!!!  
NO CHANGE!!! LEAVE IT AS IS!!!! NO CHANGE!!! LEAVE IT AS IS!!!! NO CHANGE!!! LEAVE IT AS IS!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 316 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,05,2013 13:50:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No Change!! Leave our Parks the way they are!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 317 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,05,2013 13:54:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE leave things alone. Trail riding is the life blood of the Ozark area along the rivers and small towns. There is no better way to enjoy the environment, with less disturbance than horseback riding. Why interrupt the financial assistance of the areas. We have way too much government control as it is. The Angelina trails project did extensive damage to the forests. Trees were harvested (stripped away) and the debris left. Most of the trails are eroding and way too steep. PLEASE leave things alone. Nature does not need government.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 318 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,05,2013 14:12:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Given the NPS's support of a specific option, interested parties would appreciate answers to the following:  
1) Who specifically developed these options?  
2) Who chose the preferred plan?  
3) How many trips to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways had each of these people made in the recent past?  
4) What information and observations led to the decision to exclude outboard motors from the Upper Current River above Pulltite?  
5) Which of the people involved in this suggestion have ever been present on the Upper Current River above Pulltite? And were their observations made during peak season or during the off season times?  
6) What negative impact or believed/perceived negative impact led to the proposal to eliminate motors from above Pulltite? Is there ANY empirical evidence to support such beliefs and or perceptions?  
I and my friends would greatly appreciate answers to ALL of the above questions. As an officer to more than one organization (Ozark Heritage Project, Current River Power Team) committed to the preservation of these free flowing streams and the lands and culture that surround them, as well as a member of the Missouri Press, I believe we are entitled to them. Lastly, if these answers are NOT readily available, how can you put forth and support such a proposal; particularly when such proposal jeopardizes both the culture and economy of the area with which you have been given stewardship?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 319 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,05,2013 14:30:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please leave our existing Ozark Waterway trails as they are... They are used and enjoyed immensely by Equestrians and Hikers alike and disabling any of them would bring catastrophic problems to the city of Eminence and the camps that so graciously allow us to take our minds off our problems, gather with people of all kinds, and enjoy God's great wilderness that he intended all people enjoy and use...

There is no need for any change now or in the near future...

Cindi Davis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 320 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,05,2013 14:58:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 1 in the gmp plan onsr wants to restrict motorized boats to less than 60/40 in some areas you shouldn't do that because smaller boats can't hold as many people therefore it will take more boats to haul the same amount of people, and that is less efficient ( uses more gas ) and in turn more noise. the boats have no ill affect to the river . we boaters have helped multitudes of canoers in distress . and the newer four stroke engines are much more efficient and quite than the older models . I repeat there is no reason to further limit the output of motorized boats. there should be not action taken. 2 onsr also wants to close access to the rivers . onsr has already closed too many . if anymore are closed there will be too few accesses to fight fires , get to people in case of emergency , and get to the camping ares where I have camped all my life. since I was two weeks old I have been on the river, in a wooden john boat , when rangers didn't set up cameras to watch your camp, and invade your privacy. there should be no action taken. 3 there should not be natural areas in the onsr , because it only creates confusion and the ability to see whatever cave ,spring or landmark that you are try to observe. why is it better for a few to see what a group can see? it is not better . onsr only wants to keep people out. there should be no action taken. or more trails, accesses provided to see these things. 4 increased recreational use of the onsr should be implemented for the visitors that want use motorized (atvs) so that they can see the beauty of our rivers and countryside . which are very few if any designated trails for that. why can't there be more attractions for recreational use that doesn't detract from the natural landscape. there should be more trails or no action taken. 5 there should be no zoning on the rivers that will take away my heritage and ability to see the parts of the river that I have seen all of my life and plan to see for the rest of my life. I have been from Montauk to Doniphan and from the prongs to two rivers many times . you have already taken away upper jacks fork isn't that enough .there should be no action or resend the restrictions you have already put on the upper jacks fork river. 6 restrictions are only a way to keep people from seeing and experiencing our beautiful Ozarks rivers and countryside. there are already too many restrictions and the use of the our rivers and parks reflect that. any more restrictions will further increase the downward spiral of less usage within the parks. we enough restrictions, don't put another dagger in the heart of the Ozarks tourism and people. no more action. you have already done enough.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 321 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,05,2013 15:09:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I do nt want any changes made to the current status

---

**Correspondence ID:** 322 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,05,2013 15:15:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep the National Forests open for public use. As taxpayers, we should be allowed the use of areas that our tax dollars pay for.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 323 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,05,2013 15:21:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No change.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 324 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,05,2013 15:24:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No change.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 325 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,05,2013 15:34:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO CHANGE... LEAVE IT THE WAY IT IS!!!!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 326 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,05,2013 15:48:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to keep the trails as is,,NO Change

---

**Correspondence ID:** 327 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,05,2013 16:32:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Leave it alone. No changes.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 328 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,05,2013 17:53:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have read the document and agree with the NPS preferred solution. I horseback ride at Eminence and have for decades. I camp, tour, and spend money. Many of my fellow riders want no change, but I don't think they have read your document. I agree with your preferred solution. I thought your plan is well presented.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 329 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,05,2013 18:58:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Having floated the Current and Jacks Fork River in the past, I appreciate your recommendations of adopting "Alternative A" to help maintain the status quo. However, "Alternative B" offers stronger guidelines to help insure the maintenance of a beautiful, peaceful and serene natural environment for all nature enthusiasts.

Thank you for your consideration!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 330 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,05,2013 21:30:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please don't change anything. I am from Missouri and love the scenery! I can't think of another way I would enjoy it more than from horseback. I have only recently moved to Columbia but have lived most of my life in Rolla, and believe me, I miss the bluffs and rivers of that area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 331 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,06,2013 05:55:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not change the trails, they are an important part of the beauty of the Ozarks and bring many riders from out of state. I personally have rode these trails and I believe it would severely impact the number of people that go to the Eminence area. The trailriders bring a lot of business to the Eminence area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 332 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,06,2013 09:25:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I prefer Alternative A, but would be satisfied with Alternative B as a compromise.

I will be working and can't attend any of the upcoming hearings.

We love the Current and Jack's Fork, are landowners along the Current and have spent many hours on those rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 333 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,06,2013 10:47:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a horse rider I recommend NO ACTION on the proposed closing of horse trails in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Closing the trails to horse riding will have a negative impact on tourism, and hurt local businesses that need the income generated by trail rides. It will also hurt the local trail riders who have been able to ride the trails for many years.

Again I recommend NO Action on the proposed changes to the riverways.

Bob Roach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 334    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,06,2013 11:15:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I understand that Plan B pf the Proposed Ozark National Scenic Riverways Management Plan would Eliminate Unauthorized River Crossings.  
I am against this change, and recommend NO ACTION.

Eliminating River Crossings will hurt the culture of the area. Residents of the Ozarks have been crossing the rivers for almost 200 years. It will also negatively impact the local economy, which cannot stand the loss of income from tourists who will not come to the area to spend vacation dollars.

Again I recommend NO ACTION on the issue of Eliminating Unauthorized River Crossings.

Bob Roach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 335    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,06,2013 11:25:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Test comments 2

---

**Correspondence ID:** 336    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,06,2013 11:28:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I understand that Plan B of the Proposed National Scenic Riverways Management Plan would Require Permits for Horseback Riding on the Scenic Riverways. We the people do not need a permit to ride on property that we the Tax Payers Own. We have way to much Government control in our lives at the moment without adding a permit requirement to ride on PUBLIC PROPERTY owned by the taxpayers of the United States. The Permit Requirement is just a way to cut back the public use of the Riverways.  
I recommend NO CHANGE on this issue.

Bob Roach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 337    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,06,2013 11:36:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPS,

As a lifelong user of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, I urge you to protect these rivers. My parent began taking us to the Current and Jacks Fork when I was 8 or 9. We enjoyed many summers on those rivers. As I grew into an adult, I continued to trek down to the Ozark rivers with friends and family. In fact, I just spent four days paddling the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers over the Thanksgiving Holiday weekend.

Please protect these streams from pollution and commercialization. They are truly a national treasure that should be kept pristine for future generations.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely  
Keir Thomas Haug

---

**Correspondence ID:** 338    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,06,2013 11:39:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I understand that Plan B of the Proposed National Scenic Riverways Plan would Eliminate Motor Vehicle Access to Gravel Bars. I am totally against cutting off motor vehicle access to the gravel bars on the Scenic Riverways. This change will have a serious Negative Impact on the Culture of the area. Local residents have been enjoying the use of the gravel bars on the rivers for generations.

Several years ago I enjoyed camping in what is now the Patty Creek Wilderness Area almost every weekend during the Summer. After the area was made into a Wilderness Area my access roads were blocked off, and I could no longer use the area except my foot or horseback. This change eliminated my ability to camp, and enjoy this area except in designated camping areas. I do not want this to happen in the Riverways area.

I am totally against blocking off access to the Gravel Bars. I recommend NO ACTION.

Bob Roach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 339    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,06,2013 12:02:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I understand that Plan B of the Proposed Ozark National Scenic Riverways Plan would Eliminate all ATV, UTV, and Four Wheeler Use in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

I am Totally Against this change. Infact I would like to see the Park Service open up more trails to ATV, UTV, and Four Wheeler use on the Riverways.

Back in the 1970's I enjoyed driving my Land Cruisers on the old gravel roads, and existing trails in what is now the Patty Creek Wilderness Area. Myself and several others would help keep the brush cut back, and the trails kept clear of debris for the enjoyment of all who used the trails. After the area was made into a Wilderness area the trails were blocked off, and we could no longer enjoy drivingn the trails.

I have been driving on back woods trails in Missouri with Jeeps, Land Cruisers, 3 wheelers, ATV's and UTV's for over 40 years. I have NEVER seen any Negative Impact to the Environment or Trails created by their recreational use.

I am completely against the Elimination of all ATV, UTV, and Four Wheeler use on the Riverways. I recommend NO ACTION.

Bob Roach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 340    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,06,2013 12:09:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I understand that Plan B of the Proposed Ozark National Scenic Riverways Plan would Eliminate Outboard Motors in some areas of the Riverways. I am against this change. Residents of the area have been fishing and gigging on the rivers for generations. Eliminating the use of outboard motors would have a Negative Impact on the Culture of the area.

I am totally against this change, and I recommend NO ACTION on Elimination of the use of Outboard Motors in Some areas.

Bob Roach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 341    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,06,2013 12:17:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I understand that Plan B of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Plan would Reduce Boat Motor Horsepower. I am totally against this change. Residents of the area have been fishing and gigging on the

rivers for generations. The reduction in horsepower would cause hardship on residents of the area who would have to buy new motors to meet the new requirements. In this Very Low Income area this is a hardship that residents cannot afford, and furthermore there is no need for the change.  
I am Totally Against this change, and recommend NO ACTION

Bob Roach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 342 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,06,2013 13:00:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am alarmed by some of the proposals in this plan. Closing roads, limiting river access and limiting equine access are grave concerns for me. I feel that the proposals in this plan are a threat to our rural culture. We will no longer be able to get to traditional family gathering places and even some rural cemeteries. I am in favor of leaving the plan as is and making no changes.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 343 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,06,2013 13:55:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** grew up in Missouri and have been going to Eminence Missouri for my summer vacation for 40 years now. I am gravely concerned about this proposal specifically related to closing the equestrian trails. ONSR's enabling act has three stated purposes - conservation, preservation and recreation. The recreation purpose should not be sacrificed to conservation and preservation. Rather, recreational uses should be widely accommodated. The Ozark National Riverways is a huge part of my life and I can't imagine things changing where I can no longer enjoy the beauty that it provides. I now take my children horseback riding in this area and they cherish the memories that we make while enjoying the river by horseback. While there I am continually working to be a steward of the area by making sure my children and the people that I associate with treat the area as sacred ground. It seems to me that the canoers are to blame for the trash and pollution that takes place. More regulation should be done to ensure that the rules are followed. More trash cans should be placed in areas close to the riverway. Alternative B unnecessarily eliminates my recreational use and use area(s). To better accommodate my recreational use, I suggest implementing broader resource-based recreational zoning concepts in lieu of primitive or natural zones. The NPS should explore available amenities that support a wider variety of recreational use which minimally detract from aesthetic values.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 344 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,06,2013 14:24:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** test

---

**Correspondence ID:** 345 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,06,2013 14:56:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To Whom it Concerns,  
I have been trail riding at the Cross Country Trail ride for the past 27 years. The first year we attended was back in 1986 (I was 6 years old). We have been going every year since. When we are trail riding we stay on designated trails and are all very respectful of the land. We make sure to always leave the area we ride through, just as we found it. It is a time for us to all enjoy nature and see all the wonders God has blessed the Ozark area with. It has become a family tradition. My Grandma went and now her great grandkids attend the ride. Please allow us to continue this tradition, one that brings us back to a simpler time. There are not too many places left in the world where you can go back and feel just like the people who walked it 100 years ago felt.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 346 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,06,2013 16:34:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'd like to express my appreciation to the NPS for working to improve the management of the Ozark Scenic National Riverways. I am an ecologist and botanist employed by the Missouri Botanical Garden, though my comments are made as an individual and not as an official representative of MBG. As an individual

professionally and personally dedicated to conservation, I deeply value the Ozark Scenic National Riverways. Float trips on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers (during off-peak recreational usage periods) are one of my family's favorite means of enjoying the natural beauty of the Ozarks. I am encouraged by the recommendation of Alternative B by the NPS, though needed additional protection of our priceless natural resources could be provided by Alternative A. Alternative A would do more to address illegal roads, user defined horse trails, and ATV use of gravel bars. As an ecologist and conservationist concerned about the preservation of our natural heritage for future generations, I am concerned about the impacts of these recreational uses on water quality, vegetation, and the aesthetic beauty of the river and the surrounding landscape. I strongly encourage the NPS to adopt Alternative A! Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 347    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,06,2013 16:55:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** were do I get a copy of this daft that is trying to close water crossing for horses on the current or can you send me a copy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 348    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,06,2013 17:00:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** An answer to a non existing problem. Cutting of use to any segment of the public is not why we pay taxes. No action should be taken.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 349    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,06,2013 17:19:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am an equestrian and enjoy the beauty of the trails immensely! PLEASE NO CHANGE!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 350    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,06,2013 17:23:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do NOT make these changes to our wonderful area. We are very active with camping, floating, hiking and riding in these areas. I do not want it so restrictive that it cuts us out of the right to enjoy our State. Also if you place these proposed cganges it will cost our state more money. I believe it is money we do not have.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 351    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,06,2013 17:25:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** no change

---

**Correspondence ID:** 352    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,06,2013 17:42:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No change!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 353    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,06,2013 18:14:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO CHANGE!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 354    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,06,2013 18:38:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Make no changes to the current use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 355    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208



**Received:** Dec,06,2013 18:42:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Make no changes to use of Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 356 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,06,2013 19:52:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No change!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 357 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,06,2013 23:07:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No change

---

**Correspondence ID:** 358 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,07,2013 08:22:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 12/7/13 \* \* \* \* \* ACCESS VIA CAR \* \* \* \* \*

I am a senior citizen, residing in Shannon County, and one of the joys of living near Ozark National Scenic Riverways is being able to access many points on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers via car to take in the views. Additionally, I like to drive down the roads to look at the woods and hills from different vantage points.

Closure of ANY of roads is unacceptable. I do not feel safe walking down closed roads alone to reach these destinations.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways was established as a public park to be enjoyed by everyone - no access points should be eliminated. The priceless scenery is there to be seen, not hidden at the end of a road blocked by boulders or barricades.

Please remove the boulders and barricades that were quietly installed during the writing of the Draft General Management Plan, and LITERALLY GO BACK TO THE WAY THINGS WERE BEFORE THE FIRST DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN WAS SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW.

Thank you.  
Anne Guelker

---

**Correspondence ID:** 359 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,07,2013 10:19:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to express my support for the new General Management Plan for the Ozarks National Scenic Riverways. I urge the National Park Service to adopt either Alternatives A or B, which both would help to protect this extraordinary place, which many Missourians and visitors from throughout the United States hold dear. I fear that to take no action on this plan would lead to further degradation of these beautiful rivers and the adjacent landscape.

As a resident of the Ozark Plateau, I spend a good deal of my free time during the summer visiting this park and others like it with my wife and three young children. These opportunities to canoe, camp, and hike represent perhaps our happiest family time for the whole year. It is very important to us that these invaluable public resources be protected for our children and future generations.

Regards,  
Jeremy Neely  
South Greenfield, Missouri

---

**Correspondence ID:** 360 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,07,2013 10:30:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO CHANGE!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 361 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,07,2013 12:06:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** In my humble opinion, the no action plane should be implemented. The other plans, while well researched and written, leave enough "loopholes" for more restrictive measures to creep in as time goes by. Looks and smells like an effort again for the government to grab and control public lands. I would like to see more designated horse trails but not at the cost of other trails currently being used by those who know the area trails. Secondly, the cost of these proposals is high especially when the budget has already been cut. These new laws can't be enforced without appropriate staff and funds. There are more important things in the budget. I think best to leave well enough alone. I do think people in general should be mindful of the impact they have on the land and should leave things as they found them or better. I know we choose not to ride when the ground is muddy and more vulnerable to erosion, we respect designated river crossings and carry out all that we carry in. That is my opinion, thank you for allowing public comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 362 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,07,2013 12:39:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Trying to convert the Ozark Rivers/Lands to a Yellowstone Park concept is laughable. The Ozarks are a very seasonal retreat for those that have discovered it's secret and beauty. For instance, the small town of Eminence, MO (population 500 -). The people of Eminence and surrounding areas depend on tourist attracted by the rivers and trails for their livelihood.

I believe the imposing General Management Plan, if implemented, would devastate many small communities in the Ozarks. The Plan would create a domino affect including lost revenue, land and real estate values, deficit of sales and closing of many small business' in the affected areas.

In closing and after reading the rules and regulations of the General Plan, I asked myself if I would consider entering the "Parks" if the Plan was implemented. The answer was "no" and I believe that many others in the area would have an opinion of the same.

Sincerely,

Jodi Collier

---

**Correspondence ID:** 363 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,07,2013 13:25:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The proposed limitations on various recreational opportunities will impose undue hardships on an already impoverished community! Tourism and the dollars that circulate within the local economy are imperative to the survival of the people of the area in question. Your economic impact study is flawed in that it does not predict/speculate the loss of economic dollars if your "preferred option" is implemented! Your document states that 47% o the people in Eminence and 23% o those in Shannon County currently live below the poverty line. These number will only increase when you go forward with PLAN B.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 364 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,07,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thanks to the National Park Service for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo. Nevertheless, Alternative B does not go far enough. We should adopt Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:  
Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;  
Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings;  
Bars vehicle access to gravel bars.

This is one of the most beautiful areas remaining in Missouri. Please protect it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 365    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,07,2013 19:02:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No Change

---

**Correspondence ID:** 366    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,07,2013 20:58:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Greetings,

As a United States citizen and working tax payer, I am commenting on the pending management plan. As a former local resident of the Ozark National Scenic Riverway area, I have enjoyed the area for many years and still continue to do so. I believe that with continued care and management, that the area can be maintained and used by locals and tourists alike for many years to come. I believe the current management plan with added enforcement and engineering funding would offer the best options with current funding levels. I oppose any plan that cannot be properly funded, and with the burden of our current budget deficit I am against adding more cost to implement restrictions. Regulations that restrict access, cannot be maintained or enforced are a waste of taxpayer funds. Local residents make up a very small percentage of the usage group, but seem to be the largest target of restrictions in the proposed changes. I would hope that the opinions of local residents are not overlooked versus the paid voice of lobbyist and environmental groups. As for current regulations, I believe that motorized boat use should continue to be allowed with the 60/40 rule modified to allow useage. With advancing 4 stroke motor technology,I believe sound and pollution levels will decline in the near future. As for non- motorized usage I believe that proper distribution is the key to an enjoyable experience for all with fewer complaints between user groups. An increased enforcement presence would also improve the success of the current management plan, as most of the problems noted in the study are already in violation of the current regulations. I would also support more engineering support to care for existing facilities and improvements to them, as well as added access and facilities. And again as noted above, I would hope that the small voice of local taxpayers is heard and taken into consideration when making possible changes and restrictions to the management plan.

Thanks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 367    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,08,2013 09:19:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

i personally support the below statement to protect our Earth and all Earthlings.  
COUNCIL STATEMENT

This statement reflects the wisdom of the Spiritual People of the Earth, of North and South America, working in unity to restore peace, harmony and balance for our collective future and for all living beings. This statement is written in black and white with a foreign language that is not our own and does not convey the full depth of our concerns.

The Creator created the People of the Earth into the Land at the beginning of Creation and gave us a way of life. This way of life has been passed down generation-to-generation since the beginning. We have not honored this way of life through our own actions and we must live these original instructions in order to restore universal balance and harmony. We are a part of Creation; thus, if we break the Laws of Creation, we destroy ourselves.

We, the Original Caretakers of Mother Earth, have no choice but to follow and uphold the Original Instructions, which sustains the continuity of Life. We recognize our umbilical connection to Mother Earth and understand that she is the source of life, not a resource to be exploited. We speak on behalf of all Creation today, to communicate an urgent message that man has gone too far, placing us in the state of survival. We warned that one day you would not be able to control what you have created. That day is here. Not heeding warnings from both Nature and the People of the Earth keeps us on the path of self destruction. This self destructive path has led to the Fukushima nuclear crisis, Gulf oil spill, tar sands devastation, pipeline failures, impacts of carbon dioxide emissions and the destruction of ground water through hydraulic fracking, just to name a few. In addition, these activities and development continue to cause the deterioration and destruction of sacred places and sacred waters that are vital for Life. Powerful technologies are out of control and are threatening the future of all life

The Fukushima nuclear crisis alone is a threat to the future of humanity. Yet, our concern goes far beyond this single threat. Our concern is with the cumulative and compounding devastation that is being wrought by the actions of human beings around the world. It is the combination of resource extraction, genetically modified organisms, moral failures, pollution, introduction of invasive species and much much more that are threatening the future of life on Earth. The compounding of bad decisions and their corresponding actions are extremely short-sighted. They do not consider the future generations and they do not respect or honor the Creator's Natural Law. We strongly urge for the governmental authorities to respond with an open invitation to work and consult with us to solve the world's problems, without war. We must stop waging war against Mother Earth, and ourselves.

We acknowledge that all of these devastating actions originated in human beings who are living without regard for the Earth as the source of life. They have strayed from the Original Instructions by casting aside the Creator's Natural Law. It is now critical for humanity to acknowledge that we have created a path to self destruction. We must restore the Original Instructions in our lives to halt this devastation.

The sanctity of the Original Instructions has been violated. As a result, the Spiritual People of the Earth were called ceremonially to come together at the home of the Sacred White Buffalo Calf Pipe Bundle. These Spiritual Leaders and those that carry great responsibility for their people from both North and South America came together with the sacred fire for four days at the end of September 2013 to fulfill their sacred responsibilities. During this time it was revealed that the spirit of destruction gained its' strength by our spiritually disconnected actions. We are all responsible in varying degrees for calling forth this spirit of destruction, thus we are all bound to begin restoring what we have damaged by helping one another recover our sacred responsibility to the Earth. We, the Original Caretakers of Mother Earth, offer our spiritual insight, wisdom and vision to the global community to help guide the actions needed to overcome the current threats to all life.

We only have to look at our own bodies to recognize the sacred purpose of water on Mother Earth. We respect and honor our spiritual relationship with the lifeblood of Mother Earth. One does not sell or contaminate their mother's blood. These capitalistic actions must stop and we must recover our sacred relationship with the Spirit of Water

The People of the Earth understand that the Fukushima nuclear crisis continues to threaten the future of all life. We understand the full implications of this crisis even with the suppression of information and the filtering of truth by the corporate owned media and Nation States. We strongly urge the media, corporations and Nation States to acknowledge and convey the true facts that threaten us, so that the international community may work together to resolve this crisis, based on the foundation of Truth.

We urge the international community, government of Japan and TEPCO to unify efforts to stabilize and re-mediate the nuclear threat posed at the Fukushima Dai-ichi nuclear power plant. To ensure that the Japanese government and TEPCO are supported with qualified personnel and information, we urge the inclusion of today's nuclear experts from around the world to collaborate, advise and provide technical assistance to prevent further radioactive contamination or worse, a nuclear explosion that may have apocalyptic consequences.

The foundation for peace will be strengthened  
by restoring the Original Instructions in ourselves

Prophecies have been shared and sacred instructions were given. We, the People of the Earth, were instructed that the original wisdom must be shared again when imbalance and disharmony are upon Mother Earth. In 1994 the sacred white buffalo, the giver of the sacred pipe, returned to the Lakota, Dakota and Nakota people bringing forth

the sacred message that the winds of change are here. Since that time many more messengers in the form of white animals have come, telling us to wake up my children. It is time. So listen for the sacred instruction. All Life is sacred. We come into Life as sacred beings. When we abuse the sacredness of Life we affect all Creation

We urge all Nations and human beings around the world to work with us, the Original Caretakers of Mother Earth, to restore the Original Instructions and uphold the Creator's Natural Law as a foundation for all decision making, from this point forward. Our collective future as human beings is in our hands, we must address the Fukushima nuclear crisis and all actions that may violate the Creator's Natural Law. We have reached the crossroads of life and the end of our existence. We will avert this potentially catastrophic nuclear disaster by coming together with good minds and prayer as a global community of all faiths.

We are the People of the Earth united under the Creator's Law with a sacred covenant to protect and a responsibility to extend Life for all future generations. We are expressing deep concern for our shared future and urge everyone to awaken spiritually. We must work in unity to help Mother Earth heal so that she can bring back balance and harmony for all her children.

Representatives of the Council  
Chief Arvol Looking Horse  
19th Generation Keeper of the Sacred White Buffalo Calf Pipe  
Spiritual Leader The Great Sioux Nation  
Bobby C. Billie  
Clan Leader and Spiritual Leader  
Council of the Original Miccosukee  
Simanolee Nation Aboriginal Peoples

Faith Spotted Eagle, Tunkan Inajin Win  
Brave Heart Society Grandmother  
Headswoman & Ihanktonwan Treaty Council  
Ihanktonwan Dakota from the Oceti Sakowin  
7 Council Fires  
- ADDITIONAL SIGNATURES TO FOLLOW -

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	368	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,08,2013 10:13:21				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I believe that Alternative A would be the best choice and deserves to be implemented in spite of the storm of resistance by those that have more short sighted or powerful selfish interest.				

I appreciate the efforts of the NPS in this effort. Alternative B would be an improvement over what has become negligent management that has allowed far too much damage by those that would love the rivers to death.

I am a lifelong user of the Current River and Jacks Fork Rivers starting before the ONSR existed. It is one of Missouri's, the nations and world treasures that must be protected from degradation. We have enough commercial entertainment parks of all kinds, there is only one ONSR in the world and is unique and must be preserved before it is too late. I own what looks like the only private property at the end of the road at "raftyard" above Van Buren, it is under scenic easement. The abuse and impact of those wanting to enjoy the river by building, boat, horse, ATV, 4-wheel drive truck and all the others must be vigorously controlled and managed to protect this national jewel for future generations. I do not want to bring my grandchildren to a poor imitation of what my grandfather and his generation of conservationists handed to me for safekeeping.

Please do the right thing and protect, preserve and conserve this unique treasure at the level it deserves for future generations with Alternative A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 369    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,08,2013 10:35:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do the right thing and protect, preserve and conserve this unique treasure at the level it deserves for future generations with Alternative A

---

**Correspondence ID:** 370    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,08,2013 10:47:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please adopt Alternative "A" in the planning for the Ozark Scenic Riverway. We need stronger protection for this valuable resource.

David Haggard

---

**Correspondence ID:** 371    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,08,2013 15:04:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We have floated the Current River many times, camped on its banks and enjoyed the general environment including birds and mammals. I prefer plan A. I would restrict all powerboats to the region below Van Buren, or at a minimum, reduce the horsepower allowed where powerboats are currently allowed. Every effort should be made to keep the river as undisturbed as possible. We gave up floating weekends because it is too busy and there is no sense of solitude. Fortunately, on weekdays one can usually find oneself floating alone, acquiring some sort of wilderness experience.

Thank you for the opportunity for commenting.  
Marvin and Claudia De Jong

---

**Correspondence ID:** 372    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,08,2013 19:26:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The no action alternative is the only alternative . I as a tax paying citizen of the United States, am greatly disturbed by the NPS trying to restrict and limit access to the rivers,gravel bars and motor boats. Any alternative other than the no- action would be detrimental to the local economies . Restricting the numbers of users on the rivers would equate to less money spent in the surrounding towns. These small towns can only survive on the tourist trade.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 373    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,08,2013 19:58:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No action alternative. I am against restricting gravel bar use. I camp at Log Yard 6-7 times per year and have for the past 10 years. Limiting vehicle use and camping spaces at this site would not allow me and my family to enjoy the rivers as we always have. I have made many memories camping at log yard with friends that I only get to see while there. Any restrictions or limits on usage of this gravel bar would be an infringement of my rights as a citizen of the United States . The NPS is funded by the taxpayers and is subject to review by the taxpayers. This is my review. I am also inform that the NPS would like to restrict usage of the gravel bars at Two Rivers. I have camped there in the past and would like to in the future. Restrictions would not allow me to camp with my friends .

---

**Correspondence ID:** 374    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,08,2013 20:10:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No action alternative . No more restrictions on motor boats. I own a motor boat and it is a vital piece of equipment to my hunting and fishing activities . My son caught his first fish on the Current River out of that

boat. This is a heritage that I grew up with and my son has a right to grow up with it too.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 375 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,08,2013 20:30:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** No action alternative . I am against any action that limits my access to the river or surrounding areas. NO ROAD CLOSURES!!!!!! Any closures would limit hunting opportunity's. When this happens less hunters come and the local economies suffer. The same happens with river access closures being detrimental to fishermen. This to hurts the economy. The surrounding towns are dependent upon the tourist dollars. By closing roads and river access points the canoe and floating concessioners would have a harder time getting their customers to and from the river . This could cause people to become upset and not want to come back.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 376 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,09,2013 07:49:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In regards to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan/Wilderness Study/EIS, I believe the proposed solutions are too extreme. Most preservation and conservation can be sustained by following current guidelines.

Closing the unauthorized horse/roads should already be permissible under the current rules, and I believe ATV's are already not permitted. If you close any approved trails along the river, open a new trail of equal length. Increase enforcement to prevent individuals from using unauthorized trails.

I do agree with some points however. Vehicles should not drive on the gravel bars, and motor boats should be curtailed in certain areas of Scenic Riverway.

The main point a disagree with the plan is to disallow camping on the gravel bars. For the most part campers are courteous and take any trash with them. If you wish to open a few camp sites, you would see a reduction in the number of campers on the gravel bar.

I believe this could be a happy compromise. The local area would not undergo finical hardships, and great stride will be made at preserving the river.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 377 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,09,2013 09:46:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan. I applaud the NPS in their effort to act in the best interests of the Ozark Riverways and understand the difficult task to balance the concerns of all interested parties.

Above all, I would ask that any final plan take any and all steps to preserve the resource. Ultimately, future generations will judge us by how we have managed this incredible, unique landscape. Even the most harsh criticisms of any final plan would acknowledge the worthiness of taking steps to make sure we have done everything possible to preserve and enhance the natural qualities we have all come to enjoy. Adopting a management plan with emphasis on preservation should not be viewed as punitive to any particular group. Any and all interests should be willing to support this effort for the greater good.

With a 39 year history of utilizing the Ozark Riverways primarily for canoe camping experiences in winter, we have dedicated ourselves to limiting impact on the landscape. We have witnessed first-hand the degradation to water quality caused by excessive accesses and crossings of the river. We choose to utilize the park in winter to avoid contact with canoes/kayaks/rafts that treat the river as a party zone with no environmental ethics. Our experience has been negatively impacted by disrespectful motorized boaters and unauthorized four-wheel vehicle activities. Any and all steps to curb this misuse of the Riverways is encouraged and will have a long lasting positive impact on the resource.

I have been committed to the principle of "preserving the resource" in spite of constant demands on park facilities

during a 39 year career in parks and recreation. I have always erred on the side of determining what is in the best interests of the resource. That same principle would be strongly emphasized in any final management plan adopted by NPS.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 378    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,09,2013 11:44:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please consider this message as our comment on the draft GMP for Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Although we live far from the site, we have friends in St. Louis, and I visited the Current River in my work.

We see the ONSR as a national treasure, with special value because it is situated in a region of the country that lacks many protected natural areas such as national parks. The ONSR was designated by an act of Congress in 1964 to protect 134 miles of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers.

We favor the elements described in Alternative B. This alternative continues the well established backcountry management program, which has proved its value over the years. It provides for public access in the same manner already in use, and it continues established recreational uses. We favor the acreages and boundaries indicated under Alternative B.

A few changes proposed in Alternative B are well worth adopting. We favor the removal of the obsolete underground utility line. We support moving the training range out of the ONSR to less critical lands; there it can still serve as training for NPS employees.

Roads: We support the closure of undesignated roads and access points, where unauthorized motorized vehicles have been intruding, degrading the wild character of the land and spoiling other visitors' time in the ONSR. This should include restoring 45 miles of undesignated roads to a natural condition and converting 10 miles in primitive zones to hiking trails. We also favor closing motorized camping sites on gravel bars, reducing the presence of motors on the river.

Horse Trails: To reduce excessive impacts from horseback riding, we favor closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving the design of the 23-mile horse trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

Wilderness: We favor the recommendation in Alternative B for 3,430 acres to be submitted to Congress for future designation as wilderness. The wilderness designation is the most secure protection that can be given to federal lands. It will strengthen the hand of NPS managers in rejecting inappropriate uses and activities that would spoil the natural values and wilderness character of this small area.

We wish to thank all who worked on this plan. We hope Alternative B will be adopted.

Sincerely,  
George & Frances Alderson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 379    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,09,2013 13:01:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep these precious resources and their watersheds clean and healthy for our future generations. It is our family tradition to visit each year, and we appreciate their undeveloped beauty. Thank you!  
Emma

---

**Correspondence ID:** 380    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,09,2013 13:56:56



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This management plan does not consider access to the Current & Jacks Fork rivers and trails in the event of a government shutdown, which we recently all experienced.

All management plans should have an alternate/emergency staffing plan that is made up of "caretaker" volunteers. Under no circumstances should these rivers be closed due to the fiscal mismanagement in Washington DC.

Until such an alternate/emergency staffing plan is presented many of my fellow outdoor enthusiasts will not be happy with this bill. These rivers are in our state and we will not accept closures due to US government incompetence and fiscal mismanagement.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 381 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,09,2013 13:58:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on ther draft management plan. I have been a life-long supporter of the NPS as well as having worked in a supervisory/management capacity in natural resources and park administration for nearly thirty-five years ( US Forest Service, Missouri State Parks, St. Louis County Parks, City of Clayton). I fully understand appreciate the extraordinary task involved in creating a management plan- especially within a federal agency. I fully support the preservation of this valued national resource while insuring the natural qualities inherent to this unique NPS unit.

I have had the good fortune of floating on the these two rivers for fifty years. From the very first float I took from Round to Big Springs fifty years ago I have always insured that my presence and use did not function as a detriment to the resource. Unfortunately over these many years I have opted to stay off these rivers (like many Missouri float streams) due to the overabundance, rudeness, and lack of concern created by the huge amounts of canoeists, kayakers, rafters, ATV's , four wheel drive vehicles, motorized boats and horseback riders. The volume and use of the rivers during the peak time is detrimental to the quality of the river and riparian environments as well the user experience. The ONSR is no longer a family-oriented adventure rather than an excuse for overcrowding, drunkenness, and sophomoric behavior. Motorized boats travel well too fast and cause damage to the stream banks, spawning beds and pose a danger to canoeists and kayakers alike. The no-wake policy is rarely adhered to.

It is very important that this resource is preserved for the future generations as well as use during the current time. I do not believe compromise on some issues should take place. I support what the NPS staff and the Friends of the Current River are espousing under Alternative B. However, I also support points under Alternative A. A more primitive and pristine environment should be embraced and pursued. The river and its use predates motorized boats, ATV's and massive horse trail rides. I ask that you review and consider the following deviations from the management plan as offered:

- greater restrictions on horsepower limits. 60/40 I feel is excessive. HP should be set a manuufacturers' statement of thirty (30) horsepower not forty.
- Increased non-motorized boating zones.
- Minimal intrusion by horses; no horse camps within the ONSR and enforced smaller trail rides.
- Trail ride groups should have minimal access points to cross the rivers.
- Trail ride sizes should not exceed twenty horses at any given time.
- Fewer access points and or roads within the ONSR
- All unofficial trails and roads that could or are being accessed by ATV's and 4WD vewhicles should be eliminated and restored fully.
- No vehicles, ATV's or horses allowed on any gravel bar within the ONSR.
- greater watershed protection to insure water and air quality.
- Greater stream bank restoration.
- All motorized boats, ATV's and vehicles should be 4-cycle, not 2 cycle.
- NPS staffing should be markedly increased to effectively meet management objectives and law enforcement demands.
- Greater law enforcement throughout the ONSR.
- Full wilderness designation for the Big Spring area.
- Wilderness designation should be pursued for the Upper Jacks and Current; land use and practices should be

mitigated to allow designation.

-Proper funding of land acquisition for wilderness designations should be legislated.

-Limitations put on outfitters for the number of canoes, rafts, kayaks that are put on the rivers per day.

-Outfitters should be held legally responsible for the actions and compliance of their clients.

-Air and water quality monitoring stations should be installed on both rivers.

-A fee permit system should be instituted (revolving fund?) to insure proper funding of staff, law enforcement, operations and land acquisitions.

-Carrying capacity limits should be set and rigidly enforced.

I fully understand that much of what I have proposed deviates from existing and proposed plans. However, with fifty years experience on these rivers and thirty-five as a professional there is much short and long-term benefit to be gained from a more primitive approach. I want my grandchildren and thier children to be able to experience these rivers like I did fifty years ago-with the same wonder and amazement that I felt. Thank you for your efforts and consideration. Respectfully,

Steve Brewer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 382 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,09,2013 14:22:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for allowing this opportunity for public comment. I am a frequent user of the Scenic Riverways and have canoed, jet boated, fished, and hiked this area for over 40 years. My greatest concern is that resource be protected. I recognize that the rivers are multi-use and there are competing interests but it should be managed for what is was originally and that is a wilderness. I generally use the rivers in the off season due to the excessive number of summer floaters who do not respect the resource.

1. I recommend a brief education before anyone can put on the river. The commercial outfitters should assist with this. Floaters need to be educated to move a healthy distance from the river to dig a cat hole and bury human waste. Not to leave litter in fire pits. Not to create multiple fire pits on a gravel bar. Carry out trash. Secure coolers so that contents don't dump out if canoes flip. Most people probably don't know any better and although some wouldn't bother, education before getting on the river would help. It is impossible to police but many gravel bar camping areas are despoiled with human waste during peak season. It is not only unpleasant but significantly adds to water pollution.

2. I am a jet boater as well as an avid paddle so I understand the conflicts. I am extremely respectful of non motorized floaters when I am jet boating. I agree with the 60/40 zones as stated in the preferred plan. I intentionally purchased a 60/40 motor so that I COULD use it on the Current. I agree that that the 60/40 limit should be extended from Big Spring to the southern boundary. I am sure that this is not popular but a 200 hp motor does not belong on the Current! High speeds contribute to bank erosion. I would also suggest that the NPS consider completely restricting motor boats above Round Spring or possibly even Two Rivers. This upper section should be designated as a pristine non motorized zone and would still leave lots of river for the jet boaters.

3. Restrict ATV and road access to the river. These activities are high impact and add to the deterioration of the banks and river beds and surrounding environment.

At all costs, please implement a plan that protects the resource from over use and abuse. It is a treasure that we and future generations need to protect.

Thank you,

Dave Miller

---

**Correspondence ID:** 383 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,09,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 12/9/13 \* \* \* \* \* ECONOMIC IMPACT \* \* \* \* \*

I am opposed to the ONSR Draft General Management Plan because many of its features will have a significant impact on the local economy in the Eminence area and vicinity. The people of Shannon County rely heavily on tourism - just look around in winter and notice the absence of tourists !

Just SOME of the businesses that would be impacted by the proposed new, more stringent regulations are:

- a) Canoe Rentals
- b) Motel and Cabin Rentals
- c) Restaurants
- d) Horseback Riding
- e) Grocery Stores
- f) Campground Rentals (other than NPS)
- g) Motorboat Sales

When your proposed regulations restrict the tourists' enjoyment of the ONSR, people will stop coming here.

Please go back to the regulations as they were BEFORE THE FIRST DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	384	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,09,2013 16:39:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** i share the frustration along with everyone that lives here in this rural community when government overreaches and encroaches on our liberties and freedoms, no where else in the united states have i heard of a motor horsepower restriction on a river in any state other then ONSR, there is no decision that can be made to restrict usage of the current river, if for erosion purposes that would be false yearly rainfall amounts by far does more damage than any boat motor could possibly do, if for protection of a species that would also be false, the places that the hellbender lives in is around spring outpours not accessable by motor boat and under the surface of the river, non resident people do more damage by pollution then a resident with a motor boat enjoying the river, the government is trillions of dollars in debt but somehow you manage to find the funds to destroy roadways to provide hiking trails to non resident visitors who trash and pollute the river to begin with, why cater to individuals who do not reside here, the river was gorgeous before agenda took over and the nps started catering to more suburban communities, you restricted access to the river by charging camping fees for camping on primitive gravel bars that is unacceptable, thats like charging me to park my truck at wal-mart, the onsr was meant to be enjoyed by all, not catered to by the few.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	385	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,09,2013 17:12:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	12/9/13 * * * * * ECONOMIC IMPACT * * * * *				

The new proposed Draft General Management Plan will have a severe impact on the local economy of Eminence, Missouri and the surrounding area. We depend heavily on tourism, and the proposed regulations will be devastating to our economy. Some of the areas that will be impacted are:

- a) Canoe Rentals
- b) Cabin Rentals
- c) Restaurants
- d) Motel and Cabin Rentals
- e) Horseback Riding
- f) Grocery Stores
- g) Motorboat Sales

h) Campsite Rentals

Please go back to the regulations BEFORE the FIRST Draft General Management Plan - in other words - NO CHANGE !!!

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 386    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,09,2013 17:19:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 12/9/13 \* \* \* \* \* ECONOMIC IMPACT \* \* \* \* \*

The new proposed Draft General Management Plan will have a severe impact on the local economy of Eminence, Missouri and the surrounding area. We depend heavily on tourism, and the proposed regulations will be devastating to our economy. Some of the areas that will be impacted are:

- a) Canoe Rentals
- b) Cabin Rentals
- c) Restaurants
- d) Motel and Cabin Rentals
- e) Horseback Riding
- f) Grocery Stores
- g) Motorboat Sales
- h) Campsite Rentals

Please go back to the regulations BEFORE the FIRST Draft General Management Plan - in other words - NO CHANGE !!!

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 387    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,09,2013 17:44:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 12/9/13 \* \* \* \* \* CULTURAL IMPACT \* \* \* \* \*

The new proposed Draft General Management Plan will have a detrimental effect on the cultural practices of Shannon County, Missouri. Our people treasure the ability to hunt in the woods, fish the streams, go gigging, visit old family burial sites and home places, sometimes driving old trails and roads to reach their favorite destinations.

Please do not make any changes that would prevent us from enjoying what we have valued for a century or more.

Go back to the regulations in place before EITHER Draft General Management Plan was envisioned.

We want to enjoy our rivers, trails and lands as they were before you installed boulders to block our access or prevented activities that are so vital to our local culture.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 388    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,09,2013 18:03:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 12/9/13 \* \* \* \* \* LET THE STATE TAKE IT BACK !! \* \* \* \* \*

There is a simple solution to the power grabbing being attempted by the Federal Government and, in particular, the National Park Service. Some of the ONSR park lands originally belonged to the State of Missouri. Give these lands and all other land within the ONSR boundaries to the State of Missouri !! They have an excellent Parks Department, who would maintain this treasured area, and respect the rights of those who live in Shannon County. No more blocked roads, no more senseless regulations designed to empower an army of park rangers, and no more big bureaucracy!

Let us have a park that we can enjoy for what it is, and not a "museum piece" that we must view from a distance, under the watchful eye of Ranger Police.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 389    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,09,2013 19:42:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Plan B sounds wonderful. My wife and I are regular visitors of the area. Not only would we love an increased presence of NPS with the addition of a visitor's center, but an increased police force to combat motorized vehicles would help restore the peace that we've come to seek.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 390    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,09,2013 19:55:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Why does the preferred alternative want to close river access and landings? Are you doing this so you can charge people to get on the rivers eventually? That is not part of the original legislation forming the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I do not think you should limit river access or boat landings. Also why are you against campers on the river banks? They should not be limited. There is no good reason to do this. They have never been a problem. Is this all because you want to charge people to do any camping near the river? Money should not be the cause of more regulation and limitations on recreation. Remember the ONSR is charged with preservation and recreation not to make money or drive people out of this area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 391    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,10,2013 07:44:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE LEAVE OUR CAMPING PRIVLEDGES AS THEY ARE. I AND WE HAVE CAMPED ALL ALONG CURRENT RIVER FOR CENTURIES. IT IS OUR HERITAGE. HARLEN E. BALES

---

**Correspondence ID:** 392    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,10,2013 09:49:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I fully support Alternative A so we can provide the maximum protection for the Ozark scenic riverways and wilderness areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 393    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,10,2013 09:51:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** December 9, 2013

Mike Reynolds  
Regional Director  
National Park Service  
601 Riverfront Drive  
Omaha, NE 68102

RE: Draft General Management Plan/  
Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

We, the Commission of Shannon County, would like to ask you to consider going with a No Action Plan on the basis of the economic impact study completed for our area. Our county is one of the poorest counties in the state of Missouri and we are very economically deprived. The tourism industry is our major source of income for our county government and the citizens of this county. The above mentioned plan would add to the difficult situation the county government is currently experiencing in trying to provide necessary services for our citizens. Our county does not have the resources available to supplement a loss of revenues in the tourism industry that we rely upon. The county real estate property taxes are very limited due to the ownership of over fifty percent of our land by the state and federal government. We feel this General Management Plan would greatly reduce the tourism industry as well as be a financial hardship to the local concessionaires, citizens and area businesses of Shannon County.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways was originally designated for recreational purposes. According to the Alternative B, there will only be 8.8 percent of the land the park owns as resource based recreation and 72 percent of it designated as natural, out of 88 thousand total acres. When the recreational area is greatly reduced, there is no way that will not have a significant impact on the economy of Shannon County. We feel this will also affect all tourists across the United States from being able to come and enjoy our parks.

We feel the Alternative C would have been a lesser impact on the economy of Shannon County, as it has 59.6 percent being resources based recreation and only 28.2 percent natural. We respectfully urge you to reconsider any plan that has the potential to erode our tourism industry and economic base of the county. Letter was signed by Jeff Cowen, Presiding Commissioner, Dale Counts, Northern Commissioner and Herman Kelly, Southern Commissioner.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 394    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,10,2013 09:55:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am not in favor of any plan other than a NO ACTION PLAN regarding the Ozark Scenic Riverways. All other plans place too many restrictions on the ability of all citizens to enjoy our rivers and camping areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 395    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,10,2013 12:04:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like for nothing to change ... i enjoy to take my family to NPC area... I fell that the park should open up more roads and gravel bars so the public can use them. Also have bigger hp limit so I can get my family up and down the river safely..People in this area don't have a lot .. By restriction it more would be taking a lot of family past time and heritage away..

---

**Correspondence ID:** 396    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,10,2013 12:17:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like for nothing to change . By doing drastic changes would hurt the small town in this area. it just seam like people in this area keeps getting push further and further back, were one day people can't even

put a step on the current river.. I enjoy to take my family to NPC area.. I fell that the park should open up more roads and gravel bars so the public can use them. Also have bigger hp limit so I can get my family up and down the river safely..People in this area don't have a lot .. By restriction it more would be taking a lot of family past time and heritage away.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 397 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,10,2013 12:25:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like for nothing to change . By restriction it more would be taking a lot of family past time and heritage away. I like to drive to my favorite fish hole and camping ...This is a recreational area so lets keep it that way ...

---

**Correspondence ID:** 398 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,10,2013 12:29:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like for nothing to change . People was once push off other their own land for you guy.. Now we are getting push further back. By restriction it more would be taking a lot of family past time and heritage away.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 399 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,10,2013 17:20:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The security and sanctity of the National parks is extremely important to me and my wife. I have enjoyed the pristine solitude of the wilderness areas in Missouri's part of the National Forest for so many years (about 40). Keeping the nature of nature in our state is of the utmost importance to us. It is so depressing to see people breaking the rules when it comes to taking care of and respecting the park lands.

Thus, I support wholeheartedly the plan known as Plan B. Please keep the motorized vehicles out of our national forests! They stink and ruin the landscapes. I also support restricting use of the trails for horseback riding. Near Paddy Crk, there is a "outfitter" who has run so many horses over the ground there that it appears like a highway going through the forest.

We need to take care of our forest land. If that means that more people will be required to get off their duffs and walk, then so be it. I'm sure they won't suffer.

cp

---

**Correspondence ID:** 400 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,11,2013 05:58:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This is outrageous. The"Horse Barns" look like an Urban Shopping Mall. The traffic on the River between canoes, tubes, horses etc. look like a traffic jam in the city at Rush Hour. I started canoeing the Current and Jack's Fork in 1958 when they asked you what you were catching and you answered that you weren't fishing and they looked at you like you were crazy. My Father was Admin. Asst. To Congressman Richard Bolling and they were instrumental in the process of introducing and getting The Wild and Scenic Rivers ACT passed by putting a lot of pressure on both Houses of Congress and President Johnson. The intent was to save the Rivers, which also included The Buffalo in Ark. and protecting them from just what is happening to The Current and Jack's Fork.. I visited the Buffalo River last year and was impressed by how well managed and non commercialized it has remained. My read is someone is not minding the store and enforcing the Federal Regulations that are already in place. When is Money going to stop trumping the Enviornment. I'm sure We'll hear the same BS arguments about jobs but the truth is that a select small percentage are making a killing financially and the service people working for them are not being paid that well for what is mostly seasonal employment. I agree with the Sierra Club's plan. It looks like some extreme measures have to be taken and the truth is they wouldn't be extreme if the intent of the Scenic and Wild Rivers Act had been followed and a bunch of people either figured out how to get around it or just ignore it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 401 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,11,2013 06:07:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Been going to Current River since 1975. Also a past owner of a river boat with 90 HP, Jetski, canoe and riding my horse in upper river. I say past owner as I realized in early 2000 the damage that what happening. The change of all the large boats, ATV, horse and canoes is so out of control. It is heart breaking to see all the trash in the river bottoms, damage to river banks etc. I have stopped going as the change over the years is so out of control that in a few more years, as now already, people will not know the river as it use to be and its beauty. Something I hope will be done to stop all the traffic on the river and damage to the river bottom and fish. Just go to Doniphan or Van Buren any summer weekend and you will see people who could care less about the beauty and condition of the river, now and the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 402 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,11,2013 06:25:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The NPS already owns most of the recreational land in Shannon County. Now these new alternative plans are seeking to have more and more control by limiting people from accessing the river by closing roads, access and boat landings, and riverbank camping. We saw during the government shutdown what the NPS is capable of when they "closed" their "parks" by not allowing people to even walk to the Alley Mill or access the river through their land. REALLY! No Park officials are ever their anyway! This new plan is all about more control but the park has no funds or ability to maintain what it currently has control over. You don't pick up trash anymore. Facilities are not maintained. Boaters and campers are not hurting the rivers or gravel bars. There is absolutely no proof of any harm by us. The park should focus on controlling their campgrounds at Alley, round springs, Big Springs and Two rivers where the majority of tourists camp. People that live here have a vested interest in the river and land. The park should partner with local people like they do with the Indians and other groups rather than trying to drive us out!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 403 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,11,2013 08:52:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Just wanted to express my heartfelt thanks to the park service. In this age of make the fast buck whatever the consequences we need to be stewards, and of course that will promote sustainable economy. We should learn from Arkansasw's mistake of letting a giant pig farm ruin our water.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 404 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,11,2013 11:24:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

I find myself as a user of the scenic riverways two or three times per year. Activities I enjoy there include: canoeing, fishing, and hiking. The area is a unique and I enjoy experience much of the time I am there. I note that much of the area consists of the rivers with relatively narrow strips of land along either side of the river. This tends to funnel all types of activities within these narrow bands.

One thing I have noticed is some degradation of the environment based upon the increasing number of trails, many created by illegal ATV use. Sometimes, we camp on the river, and we fear that some of the sites we camp at; that are obviously extensively used by ATVS, based upon the patterns at site, may visit our site in the middle of the night. I would support alternative A, that would close these trails. ATVs not only disturb campers, but also damage fish habitat in the smaller steam areas neat the river. The fact of the matter is that ATVs can use other streams and gravel bars outside of the National Park to have fun, rather than disturb the environmental of this national treasure.

I also notice that particularly in the reach of the river neat two rivers, that there is extensive horse riding activity, and that degradation of the water quality of the river is apparent. Although I believe that horse riding should continue,



the number of horses that use the area, appear to be excessive, and perhaps, there could be a way to reduce the density of this activity.

I support alternative one based primarily on the need to close illegal trails and keep the density of activities at a manageable level.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 405 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,11,2013 12:20:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am not sure which, if any, plan described would be the best solution. In my opinion the government already has too much control of land. People should be allowed to go where they want using whatever means of transportation they choose. My choice of plans would be one that removed all government control of parks and lands. When the government was shut down, the rivers were closed during gigging season. This was inconvenient for many people. Some people rely on gigging to provide food for their families.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 406 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,11,2013 13:58:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I ride horses in the ozarks, the gravel you use damages there hooves and is not good for foot travel, , the inclines you proved endangers the horse and rider, hikers, the tarps and flags you leave endanger horse and rider by spooking horse or horses. You tell us where sit on the river bank, where to have gathering on the river bank, where to cross the river, how to keep it clean, stay on designated trails, how to build a camp fire and put it out, where and how to dispose of trash, but it's time to stop taking over land, if roads are there keep them open and serviceable not black top. Keep camping primitive, people are not there for electricity, they can bring a generator, solar or batteries, campers/hikers are welcome they don't interfere with horses we can pass them safely or they can pass us, canoes there fine, horse people watch out for them. I have heard complaints about horse droppings in the river where do they think the wild horses droppings go or the fish poop, deer droppings and all the rest of nature out there. If you don't like sweat, dirt stay home. National park service/EPA, KEEP OUT, if I could afford a billboard on every highway in this great land we call the United States of America it would read dismantle the EPA you prevent prosperity, government has too much control, ownes to much land, is to involved in individual lives. Government if you want to take over things keep highways open, provide free communication, phone and internet, free utilities water, electricity, natural gas, and decrease auto gas/desil. Guess that's enough please leave the Ozarks alone

---

**Correspondence ID:** 407 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,11,2013 15:11:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** After review of the proposed alternatives, I favor the "No Action" alternative, or the current management plan. If that is not an option, I would favor alternative "C", since it appears to result in the least amount of changes to the current management plan. I am satisfied with the current management of the riverways, and do not believe in further restrictions on the use of our rivers. The only change I would like to see, however, is a weekday, preferably a Monday or Friday, that would eliminate or limit motor boat use during the "peak season" on the rivers upstream of Powder Mill. This would allow a better experience while fishing from a canoe. Fishing on a weekend from a canoe is not that good due to not only motorboats, but the number of canoes on the river on a weekend.

I do not support any further restrictions on horseback riding within the lands managed by ONSR. I also do not support any further lands being designated as "wilderness area", not only within ONSR, but elsewhere throughout the U.S. Wilderness designations eliminate resource recovery (minerals, timber, oil and gas, etc.), increases wildfire potential, and prevents revenue generation for the government and the private sector.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 408 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,11,2013 15:14:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Sirs,  
As a Missouri Master Naturalist and a citizen very involved in conservation issues, I urge you to approve and

activate the program to protect Missouri's Ozarks National Scenic Riverways. The press of population necessitates that our natural heritage, which belongs to posterity, not just to us today, be protected from degradation due to unlimited ATV and 4-wheel drive and horseback riding trail usage. Many creatures and their scenic habitat will be destroyed if there are not reasonable regulations to protect them. Thank you. Ronda Sherrill

---

**Correspondence ID:** 409    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,11,2013 16:35:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support a comprehensive responsible management plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways that provides responsible public use but also provides essential management and protection of the natural resources and these beautiful waterways.

In review of the key excerpts of the draft GMP, I too tend to favor Alternative B in the listing of alternatives for the National Park Service planning team to focus toward. While I will be unable to attend any open house or public meetings, as an environmental professional and advocate for our natural resources, I anticipate that my voice will be heard through the Missouri Chapter of the Sierra Club.

Thank you for allowing me to provide comments on this significant and important planning process. Likewise, I certainly hope the plan receives the proper funding and staffing support.

Sincerely,

David Tyson  
Independence, MO 64050

---

**Correspondence ID:** 410    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,11,2013 18:47:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The development of this management plan is greatly appreciated and addressing the issues concerning the Current and Jacks Fork River is extremely important. I strongly recommend that one of the three management plans be implemented. I do not believe doing nothing is an option. To do nothing would further damage this river system.  
I have canoed the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers for over thirty year. I have also enjoyed hiking the many trails in the area. Usage of the two rivers has dramatically changed over the years. Motorized vehicles have greater access to the river because of the vehicles increased four wheel capabilities. Noise and destroyed vegetation from these vehicles is degrading the river system.  
In addition to motorized vehicles, horse back riding has greatly increased. My experience is that horses are damaging the gravel bars and making them unusable because of horse manure. There also appears to be increase motorized boat traffic on the river.  
Because of the above issues I support Plan A. I particularly like the reduction of illegal horse trails and horse crossings of the two rivers. Another strong point for this plan is the change in the permitted power boats above Two Rivers.  
If plan A can not be implemented than I support Pan B as the next best plan in this document. Plan A addresses the issues the best from the stand point of a canoeist,hiker and camper in the Current River and Jacks Fork area. Please implement one of the plans (hopefully Plan A) as soon as possible. Time is of the essence to prevent further damage to these rivers that could have harmful effects for generations to come. The thousands of individuals and families that visit these rivers each year do so expecting rivers that are scenic and an experience that allows them to enjoy the rivers with a minimum of motorized noise and pollution.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 411    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,11,2013 21:42:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to suggest that you do not close a legal access point until you have built the replacement site first.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 412    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,12,2013 10:25:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To keep the beautiful Ozark National Scenic Waterways for our children and grand children, regulations are needed to prevent all terrain vehicles and an excess of floaters from ruining these streams. Too many people worked too long to get these waterways under federal control to allow their being ruined.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 413 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,12,2013 10:35:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Having read the Park Service's GMP Summary of Key Excerpts and having floated most of the length of rivers involved, I would like to endorse Alternative A. I do so primarily on the grounds that it provides for the greatest expanse of river without motorized traffic of any kind, and secondarily because it provides the most 'Primitive' and 'Natural' land use.

Non-motorized rivers are almost impossible to find outside the National Scenic Riverways, and primitive and natural public lands are not much more common. If this 'state of nature' is not provided by the National Scenic Riverways then it will not be available at all.

Of the various aspects of the other alternatives, the visitor education and interpretive center proposed for Powder Mill and the expansion of the curatorial facility under the Park Service's preferred Alternative B are the most appealing and could easily be incorporated into Alternative A.

Thank you for your time and attention.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 414 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,12,2013 14:44:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly suport the no action alternative. I live on the river 365 days a year and see very little pressure on the resource except for six weekends a year during the summer. Those weekends can be sporadic with visitors depending on the weather. And besides for a small amount of litter the tourists have zero impact to the area as compared to a six foot plus rise of which no one has control. There are countless days in the summer of which only a handful of visitors are present. As far as the outboard motors go, again little impact as compared to a several foot rise. The large majority of boaters I see on the river are an asset due to helping floaters in distress. Myself as friends have untangled canoes and tubers from root wads. Some in distress others not so much. In one case this year a drowned person. The attempt to rescue the person was done several minutes before law enforcement was on the scene. I and a friend personally cut a woman loose from the same root wad the young man hand tangled and drowned in the week before. She was in grave danger. If not for the motorized boat I don't know if we could have helped her. Boaters are responsible for removing much of the litter left behind by canoe and tube floaters. I have been in the park and on the river a large portion of my life and again the only damaging changes I've witnessed are done by mother nature. Much of my family's spare time is spent in and around the park. Many days we encounter no one. Some days just a few. The park is well taken care of now. We need no more government regulation. I would think less time and money should be spent on additional regulations and plans and more time and money spent on upgrading access points, roads, and law enforcement of the many rules we already have.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 415 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,12,2013 15:23:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I think that there should be NO changes to the current regulations. I don't want any rights taken away so that my children and future grandchildren can enjoy the river and riverways the way that I, my parents, and grandparent, etc. have enjoyed it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 416 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,12,2013 18:56:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe god gave us these river's and stream's to enjoy and not to be so controlled like you all are wanting to do. yes i do believe there need's to be some restriction's but you all are going WAY OVERBOARD it

need's to stop some where. So i feel there need's to be "NO ACTION" taken. There are more motor boat owner's that help the floater's and we don't get any credit for that. The motor boat owner's do river clean up NOT the floater's or kayaker's or the hiker's. All you all want to talk about is let it go to the wildlife, well i don't think the wildlife is in any danger at this point. My goodness you have given the cave's to the bat's and tree;s to the bug's. I beleive the "NATURALIST IS WENT WAY WAY OVERBOARD" The drama need's to stop.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 417    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,13,2013 09:07:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of the "no action plan" because I feel that gravel bars should be accessible to those of us that access them by vehicles. If this right is denied we will no longer be able to enjoy camping at Log Yard gravel bar. This is a tradition for our families. When we camp there we leave it in as good or better shape than we found it. We pay to camp just like any other campground. I want my son to be able to enjoy this campground for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 418    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,13,2013 09:14:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of the "no action plan" so that myself, my family and friends are able to continue to enjoy the Current River in our boats. Many memories have been made on the Current River. My son caught his first trophy fish there at the age of 8. We are teaching him to appreciate our natural resources and take care of them. Also, if boats are restricted from Current River this is going to impose a huge negative impact to the local economy. We travel to Current River a minimum of 5 times per summer. We spend money at local businesses to fill our boat and vehicle with gas, for food, etc. If we no longer have access to the river we will no longer be spending this money.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 419    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,13,2013 09:20:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In favor of the no action plan because I am against closure of river acces points and closure of roads. This would limit hunting and fishing opportunities. My family and myself have hunted and fished there our entire lives. If this is restricted there will be congestion at access points left open. It will also impact the local economy negatively due to fewer people coming to the area to hunt,fish, and enjoy other activities.

Park Service land should be for the people to use. ALL people. As a citizen of the Ubpnited States theses lands were set aside to be managed for me and my family to enjoy. My tax dollars go toward preserving, maintaining and policing theses lands. My rights to use it should not be restricted.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 420    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,14,2013 09:21:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I prefer Alternative A to best protect the Current and Jacks Fork rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 421    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,15,2013 23:25:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern,

After reviewing the DMP, it is my belief that the NPS should implement and enforce Alternative A. I grew up in Salem, Missouri, and I have floated/canoed/fished the Current River my entire life. I currently live in Oklahoma City, but I try to make it to the river every time I visit my parents. Sometimes I only have time to drive down to Akers or Welch Spring, and walk along the shore. But I thoroughly enjoy every single time I get to be on or around the Current, especially when I get to experience the Current without anyone else around. I love the gorgeous natural setting of the Current River.

However, I fear the Current River is in danger of being negatively impacted by people who do not respect the

Current River or the areas surrounding the river. During the summer months, the Current is overrun with people on weekends - many of them drunk - that are only interested in partying rather than enjoying the beauty that the Current provides. They show no respect for others on the river. They drive their vehicles onto gravel bars without considering the impact such vehicles could have on the river and blare their music (much of which contains profanity and adult themes unsuitable for the ears of children). Many children are subjected to obnoxious and offensive behavior (including lots of profanity) that seriously affects their experience of the river in a negative way. A specific example I witnessed a couple of years ago occurred at an area named "Flying W" where several drunk people were jumping off bluffs into the river (even though I believe jumping off bluffs was banned along the Current at the time this incident occurred). As canoes floated under the bluffs, the drunk idiots (for lack of a better term) would jump off the bluffs and splash near such canoes in an attempt to overturn the canoes, or, at the very least, splash those in the canoe with water. Several canoes had children in them, some of which were no older than four or five years old. I was appalled, and I'm sure the families that had to deal with the dangerous actions of these drunk idiots were as well. As a result of actions such as these, many families avoid the river on the weekends during the summer, which is the peak season for the river. I support any alternative that may cut down on such obnoxious behavior while giving families and those that truly enjoy the beauty of the Current River a chance to experience the river without such obnoxious behavior.

I believe Alternative A is the option that best fosters a respect for the natural environment of the Current River and the people who truly appreciate the river. I believe Alternative A will allow the Current River, as well as the rest of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR), to be restored to a much more natural, beautiful, wondrous environment. I believe Alternative A will preserve the beauty of the ONSR and cut down on activities that harm the ONSR, while still allowing for ample recreational activities that foster an appreciation of the ONSR. I encourage the NPS to seriously consider making changes to the way it has managed the ONSR since the 1984 DMP. Specifically, I encourage the NPS to implement Alternative A, which is the option that respects both the ONSR and people who visit the ONSR more than any other alternative presented, including the No Action alternative. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Nathan Prugh

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	422	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,16,2013 08:42:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I use the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for both the river and trail-hiking beauty and benefits. They provide outstanding natural beauty and exploration of nature opportunities. I supp the Plan "B" Alternative which seems to best describe what would limit equestrian and road overuse as well as promote visitors' usage.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	423	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,16,2013 09:10:40				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** As a concerned boater and retired USFWS fish biologist, I support the objectives contained in Alternative B, proposed for the new rivers Management Plan. The existing trends of expanding impacts within the near watersheds cannot be ignored if the objectives of the Riverways are to be upheld for future generations.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	424	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,16,2013 12:38:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Project maintenance should be reverted to State level for following reasons:

The entire functionality of this project should be reverted to state level. The federal government will save millions of dollars by sending this to state level. The state level will then be able to create many local jobs (usually at a lower pay rate) with a more vested interest.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 425 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,16,2013 12:49:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** By eliminating access and eliminating the trail system here, the already poverty stricken Shannon County (Shannon county has the lowest per capita income and unemployment rate in the state). The city of Eminence and other areas involved will lose income from recreation (horseback riding/canoeing/kayaking/fishing/boating). Go to downtown Eminence and see how many existing empty buildings already are there. Add to it the remainder of the town - this will guarantee closing of their doors.

I moved here from New Orleans this past year. Many of my friends from out of state visit me. They utilize the river and horse trails. They also go to the gas station to get gas; the grocery to get food; shop at the local stores. If this plan goes thru, the economy of Eminence will falter more since they are dependent on visitors. In addition, if I am not allowed to go out my front door to the trails, crossings, river, etc, I will more than likely sell my house and move back to Louisiana. The economy will suffer again because it will be another house for sale added to the enormous list of empty house for sale. No one will want to buy my property or any other property if they have an interest in the use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways area. Add my house for sale along with others from out of state who have moved here to utilize the amenities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 426 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,16,2013 12:52:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** By closing many of the access points to the river for both horseback riders and boaters/fisherman would cause a hardship and safety issue. Anyone injured in the river or along it would have a huge problem in getting medical assistance. Many boaters help the injured or those needing help. Catastrophy fixing to happen!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 427 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,16,2013 13:43:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please adopt plan "A" to provide the most protection for the rivers. Wild & Scenic Rivers are supposed to be wild, not a water park!

I have been canoeing these rivers for over 40 years & have seen the degrading quality as overuse has been allowed to run rampant. There will be not "wild & scenic" left if something isn't done NOW!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 428 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,16,2013 14:27:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** NO ACTION PLAN!!!!!!!!!!!!!! I am 47 years old, and I am a native of the Carter & Shannon County areas. All my life I have enjoyed the current and jacks fork rivers. As a kid my grandparents took me camping on the Current River, we took our boat and fished and enjoyed swimming, riding in boat and camping right on the gravel bar. As an adult I have enjoyed the same things. I take my kids, and grandkids to the river ever weekend. We fish, swim and boat ride. We camp on gravel bar right next to the river. We also enjoy gigging in the winter months on river. I have experienced this hobbie all my life. I don't think that the NPS should try to take away my right, and my kids, grandkids right to enjoy thes hoppies or to tell the local people where they can access the rivers, where we can or can not camp at. My big pet peeve is, trying to shut down the rivers to our boats and motors. As a local to these areas, I believe we should have more say about our rivers, than these so called naturalist, from different states around the us, that may or may not have ever been here. Before the NPS took over our rivers, local business men used the rivers, one to hunt and trap for sale of fish and wildlife. Other used rivers to send logs to the saw mills. So what is the difference in using the rivers for that or for local hobbist. We are not the ones polluting the rivers... Its the tourist that come here from all over the world. I work as a court clerk in the Shannon Co Circuit Court and process all the tickets that are written on the rivers, which,some include for Possession of Marijuana, Littering, Possession of all kinds of illegal drugs, indecent exposure, etc. Those are the people that are polluting and destorying our rivers, and camp sites. Tourism is what makes our cities grow,and we all need to be able to experience the beautiful rivers,but I believe if the people (locals or tourist) that are breaking the law by polluting rivers, camp sites, disturbing our river banks from ATV access should be ticketed. But please don't take our camping access and boating privlidges away. Its our way of life growing up here!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 429    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,16,2013 19:48:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to voice my opinion on the management plan. River access and atv. use, I feel that if you stay on the roads that have been here for many years, and cause no trouble you should not be punished for someone else's actions. My sister and family have came several times a year to ride their atv and have family fun, and also have spent a fair amount of money to ride their atv. River access is very important not only used for fire. They are also used for emergency reasons. There are places on the river that are very sentimental to people that will be closed off if this plan goes through. Me and my family enjoy going to the river to camp and picnic several times a year that will be taken away if this plan goes through. I would also like to make a comment on the river boat use on the jacks fork and current river. I have been here for 16 years, and I can see no damage that the boats have done to the river. Me and my family enjoy the boat use around here as many other family's enjoy, and also brings in revenue for the county and state, and don't forget the working man and his family.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 430    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,17,2013 13:17:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have stopped visiting the Current and Jacks Forks Rivers because of lack of management and security. As a single woman, it seems that no one else wants to go there with me, because of its reputation for people who "do their own thing." If it were more secure, I'd rent canoes, as well as camp and buy food and supplies there. Until I'm convinced that it's safe, that money will be spent elsewhere. It's too bad, as I remember this as an absolutely beautiful area with the clearest rivers outside northern Michigan!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 431    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,17,2013 16:33:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am concerned about the water quality of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. And I feel that horses and Equestrian trails need to be limited or re-routed so the rivers do not continue to get contaminated with Equine E-Coli and other pollutants.  
Thank you.

W.C. Shocklee  
Fisherman  
Outdoorsman  
canoe-boatsman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 432    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,17,2013 17:32:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan. I especially support the efforts to limit motorized access to gravel bars. Keeping cars, trucks, ATVs etc off gravel bars is essential to the integrity of the natural and scenic character of the rivers.

I support Alternative A as the most protective option.

Thanks to the National Park Service for their work on this document.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 433    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,17,2013 17:54:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Alternative B. There will always be pressure to relax rules and standards that, if implemented, will degrade this outstanding national park. These demands for change will come because of population growth and more and more user groups wanting to use the Riverways for their particular activity. ATVs and stand up paddle boards, for example, hadn't even been invented when the Ozark National Scenic Riverways were first established. What other recreational devices will be developed in the future, with the users of such

wanting their piece of the Riverways too? Other pressures, such as water quality degradation, stream bank erosion, invasive species and more access, etc. will always exist which will require due diligence in protecting the resource.

The original objectives and purposes of protecting the Riverways must always remain the prime driver when considering any changes in management. We could easily "love the river to death" through overuse or degrade it with our recreational toys, losing or damaging in the process the qualities that make the Riverways so unique and special.

A most disturbing change I have observed over the 50 plus years I have canoed the Riverways has been the increasing use of the rivers as a place for people to party and drink. On the weekends many young floaters have discovered they can party in relative anonymity on the rivers with little fear of law enforcement or adult supervision. This makes a river a "place of choice" for partying rather than land based locations where they are more apt to get into trouble. This activity then becomes a misuse of the river in my opinion. The only saving grace is that canoes themselves create little if any harm to the river. That can't be said however about the human waste large crowds of partying floaters deposit along the way.

I encourage the National Park Service to "stand your ground" when it comes to managing and protecting this resource. Political and influential people will constantly apply pressure to change something to benefit them or their constituencies. You are the primary protector when it comes to managing the Riverways and protecting the qualities that make the Ozark National Scenic Riverways the unique resource that they are to people from all over the US.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	434	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,17,2013 18:08:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I support the Alternative B option. We should protect nature for the future generations. Yet, I have had a lot of fun on floating and camping on these rivers. It would be a shame to not be able to enjoy those activities again.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	435	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,18,2013 08:37:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Although I prefer action alternative A, there are aspects of alternative B that I find attractive. I support having the campground at Akers Ferry reopened and developing a campground at Blue Spring on the Jack's Fork. I have generally stayed at Pulltite campground but Akers Ferry is more conveniently situated for day paddling trips on the Current River headwaters. The campground at Alley Spring on the Jack's Fork is really too far away to be convenient for paddling trips on the Prongs or the upper Jack's Fork River.

What I am not too happy to see are potential plans for a 25 site horse campground on the Jack's Fork or the Current River for that matter. With a huge horse facility available near Eminence, I question the need for it, but my main concern is the possibility of contamination from horse manure. There seems to be good evidence that fecal contamination from horses has been a significant contributor to poor water quality on the Jack's Fork River below Eminence in the past.

One improvement that I would favor that is not mentioned in any of the action alternatives is a better approved access on the Current River between Round Spring and Two Rivers. This 18 mile stretch of river is too long for many individuals to undertake as a day trip, and gravel bar camping is not for everyone. The road to Jerktail Landing leaves much to be desired. Ideally, what I would like to see is an improvement to that road, and if possible, development of a new river access site just a bit upstream of the existing Jerktail Landing (if possible), which would more evenly divide into two parts the stretch of river from Round Spring to Two Rivers.

Although I would favor the motor traffic restrictions in Alternative A to those in Alternative B I don't feel terribly strongly about it. Otherwise apart from the concerns mentioned above I fully support the NPS favored Alternative B.

I would point out, however, that without enforcement any proposed regulations are useless. It is pretty generally accepted that for whatever reasons, NPS enforcement of the regulations in the existing GMP have been thoroughly ineffective overall.



---

**Correspondence ID:** 436    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,18,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you, National Park Service, for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis.

Adopting Alternative B would be a big positive step forward from the status quo, nevertheless I agree with the adoption recommended by the Missouri Sierra Club. Alternative B does not go far enough. Alternative A provides important additional protections for the rivers.

Of most importance, Alternative A closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads; it closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings; and it bars vehicle access to gravel bars.

Thank you for your careful consideration of the future of these important waterways.

Sincerely,  
Ann Megyas

---

**Correspondence ID:** 437    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,18,2013 12:12:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I live in the City but I bring my family to camp and boat ride in the Country every year. I want be able to continue camping on the gravel bar and taking my family down the river. If we can't have a 60/40 motor, I can't take my whole family in the boat. A 25 hp motor just won't carry us all. We love camping on the gravel bars. We don't bother anyone and no one bothers us. We always clean up after we leave. The only complaint I have is the Park Service used to have trash cans but they have taken them all out. I says just leave things the same or as they say, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."

---

**Correspondence ID:** 438    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,18,2013 12:12:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a native Missourian, an avid hiker, and a lover of the outdoors, I'm writing to support Alternative B as the best plan for the future use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverway. Though not as rigorous as I might have liked, it does address the problems that have plagued the area: motorized intrusion via unauthorized roads, the number of river access points, and equestrian overuse and damage to resources, while it provides ecological restoration and improved visitor experience. The NPS has done a good job in this instance, and Alternative B is the best choice.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 439    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,18,2013 20:05:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We want you to leave the scenic river as is, the people here enjoys this river, city people need to worry about the rivers in there area and leave ours alone, we pay taxes to the park service and they should listen to the people around here.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 440    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,19,2013 10:56:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Ask yourself one question. Can you afford to piss off the local people to make a group in Kirkwood happy.

Hope and change are not what we want. We hope it won't change.

No-Action is the only way to make everyone happy-happy-happy.

This plan has been on hold since 2009 and now that Congress has finally passed a budget, what Congress has given, Congress can take away.

Funding for this new plan will be hard to get when the US debt is over \$17 trillion.

Local politicians listen to local people because Kirkwood does not VOTE for them. The GREATER-GOOD in this case is to listen to the locals.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 441    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,19,2013 15:42:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you NPS for developing a great management plan for the Ozark National Scenic River ways! We Missourians love our rivers. We all have different ideas of what the river provides as far as recreation. I support the adoption of plan B. I would have liked to see stricter guidelines such as those in plan A, for example no vehicles should be on the ever-changing gravel bars. However I think that some of the road closings and other factors would hinder recreation opportunities for the local river enthusiasts.

These locals can be hard-headed and stuck in the old ways. But one thing is for sure: They love the river. They are supporting what they think is best for the river. I hope to see more education offered to these people. Through education brings understanding.

The NPS has the duty as well to listen to the concerns of the locals. I assume the planners have formal education and experience dealing with land management plans. This often leads to the thought "We know better than they do".

This is a dangerous mindset. If you don't try to understand local tradition and their relationship with the wilderness then you may be pushing people away from the nature they have loved. Pushing people away from the river and the wilderness would be detrimental to the river ways and our environment as a whole.

Missourians must learn how to love their local places of wilderness if they are going to continue supporting a conservation agenda. But by working with the locals, and educating them about responsible river access and usage, hopefully support and cooperation will improve. I am optimistic that this plan will ultimately be a good thing for the wildlife of the now federally protected area.

Thank you for your time

-Frequent floater, inspired youth, Student, Nature Nut, Kelly K.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 442    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,19,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** On behalf of Environment Missouri's more than 13,000 supporters, activists, and members, we applaud the National Park Service for releasing a draft General Management Plan that offers the potential for the restoration and protection of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and we urge them to adopt Alternative "A" in lieu of their preferred alternative.

Nearly fifty years ago, the people of Missouri entrusted two of their most spectacular rivers to the NPS. The agency established the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, the first-ever national park created exclusively to protect a river and its watershed. The NPS promised to take a snapshot of the rivers in 1964 and preserve them in that condition for future generations.

Unfortunately, that didn't happen. Decades of mismanagement and neglect have taken their toll on the parks.

According to current estimates, access points on the rivers-places where the foliage has been broken in order to allow access by trucks, ATVs and RVs-have proliferated from the original dozen or so official points to over 130. Rather than use the 23 miles of park-designated horse trails, designed to minimize equestrian impact on water quality and maximize the safety and enjoyment of all park visitors, local horse operators guide tours on over 80 miles of trails. This has resulted in e. Coli impairment on the Jacks Fork. Overcrowding, scenic easement violations, and a general "anything goes" atmosphere all contribute to the degradation of the wilderness surrounding the rivers, the quality of the water in the rivers, and the overall park experience.

This is unacceptable. These are among the most beautiful rivers on the planet, and the park is one of the few wild places where people can explore a world-class spring system. The NPS is supposed to protect and preserve the

beautiful places that make America such a natural wonderland. Their failures to enforce the previous management plan, and the overall inadequacy of the 1984 plan itself, are a failure to respect the wishes of the citizens of Missouri, who consider these rivers the gems of the state; and the wishes of all Americans, who rely on the NPS to ensure that our nation's special places remain special.

Visitors to the park-the vast majority of them from outside the Ozarks and outside of the state-are the single biggest contributors to the economies of Shannon, Carter and Dent counties, which rank among the most impoverished in the state. Should the rivers lose their natural charm, people will stop visiting. And if people stop visiting, the communities that live along the river will suffer economically.

Further, the park provides critical habitat for the Ozark Hellbender, an endangered salamander unique to Southern Missouri. Worsening water quality (an unavoidable result should the NPS fail to take adequate action) could result in the extinction of this 65 million year old species.

Fortunately, the NPS has listened to community leaders, small businesses, environmental groups, and nearly 15,000 petitions from locals, Missourians, and people from across the country, who have asked for stronger protections for Missouri's river gems.

We congratulate the NPS on their decision to appoint Bill Black as Superintendent of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Superintendent Black has done an excellent job righting some of the long-standing wrongs that have tarnished the park's reputation. However, his ability to do so is hampered by the 1984 GMP, which was inadequate when it went into effect nearly 30 years ago and is seriously outdated now.

The draft GMP that the NPS has released shows that they've heard what we've known for years-that the vast majority of Missourians think that the Current and Jacks Fork rivers deserve the protection and preservation that the NPS promised when they established the park. We urge the NPS to make their first priority in choosing an alternative the restoration of the Current and Jacks Fork to their 1964 conditions. We urge them to focus on preserving the wild nature of the rivers and traditional Ozarks heritage, as well as fostering deeper communication and understanding between park staff, the locals, and the people who travel from around the world to enjoy the park's spectacular beauty.

We urge the NPS to adopt Alternative "A", which provides the strongest protections for the rivers and does the most to establish deeper, more meaningful connections between the NPS, the region, and the park's visitors.

Alternative "A" does the least violence to the National Environmental Protection Act and conforms more closely to the original intent of the NPS to "take a snapshot of the river" and keep it in a similar state for future generations to enjoy. Further, Alternative "A" does the most to address many long-standing issues with the park, and puts into place protections that will ensure that the rivers are as beautiful twenty years from now as they were twenty years ago.

Alternative "A" accomplishes these goals through an aggressive plan to close roads and illegal access points and to provide equestrian experiences that allow horse-riders and boaters alike safe enjoyment of the park. Alternative "A" provides for the management of almost 3,500 acres of the Big Springs area as wilderness and places sensible limits on boat horsepower on ecologically-sensitive parts of the river. Alternative A better manages access points on the river, increases the number of hiking trails in the park, and provides the most cultural engagement with traditional Ozarks folkways.

Further, Alternative "A" does the most to engage the public with the park, by providing a large number of experiences designed to educate visitors on natural features and Ozarks heritage. Alternative "A" allocates the most resources to the enforcement of the rules that keep the park the special, safe and beautiful place that attracts millions of people from around the world each year to the Ozarks. Alternative "A" also seeks to develop an official "friends group" that would foster greater communication between the NPS, the communities that live along the rivers, and people that return to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways year after year.

Our more than 13,000 members, supporters, and activists we thank the NPS for taking the first steps towards addressing serious issues that have plagued one of our nation's greatest natural parks for decades. On behalf of those

who have enjoyed the park since its establishment and on behalf of the future generations of Americans who will come to the Current and Jacks Fork rivers to canoe, hike, swim, fish, and experience the Ozarks, we urge the NPS to adopt Alternative "A" and protect the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for the next twenty years.

Sincerely and with great appreciation,

Stuart P. Keating  
State Advocate  
Environment Missouri

---

**Correspondence ID:** 443 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,20,2013 08:13:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in support of the "No Action" alternative regarding this issue. While I feel very strongly about keeping our parks and natural resources clean and well maintained, I know that any of the proposed plans will negatively affect the residents of our area. I feel that in an attempt to further regulate this area it will only penalize the people who do abide by the rules and regulations currently in place. No amount of regulations will change the behavior of the people who violate the rules of these parks. They will continue to do so while the people who are abiding by the rules will lose access to the activities that make this area such a wonderful place to live in. I believe wholeheartedly that it is a colossal mistake to allow this to happen. Please take the time to consider who is really going to be negatively affected by this proposal and don't let it be the law abiding resident.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 444 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,20,2013 08:47:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As an avid stream smallmouth bass angler, canoeist and wilderness camper, I strongly support Alternative B as preferred by NPS for the management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I believe it offers a balance approach for citizen use of this valuable natural recreational resource. The draft Plan curbs abusive practices including unfettered vehicular access, motorized water travel in areas incongruent or unsafe for such watercraft, and restricts overnight RV camping to appropriate venues where they will not detract from other users' experiences using the waterways.

ONSR is a indeed an National Park and a national treasure. It should be managed in a manner that preserves its wildness and pristine characteristics while allowing reasonable use by the public in a manner fitting of that designation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 445 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,20,2013 09:14:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a respectful horseback rider, I am opposed to restricting the access to the Ozark National Scenic Waterway to just environmentalists. Such beautiful country should not be restricted to anyone - we should all be able to use it. We have ridden in that area many times and are always mindful of rules and regulations. Excluding horseback riders would greatly decrease the economy of some of the areas located close to the waterway in southern central Missouri. There is such beauty on the waterway that can only be reached if on horseback. Please do not take away access to the waterways from campers and riders.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 446 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,20,2013 11:26:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I definitely support the "No Change" Plan because not only do I spend the majority of my summer on Current River but so do my family and friends. I grew up down on Current River at a location where my Grandma and her family was born and raised. My Grandma had a house down on the Current River and they also went to school down on Current River. I have and see so much history each time I go to Current River. Also my Grandmothers siblings and parents are buried at several locations on Current River. It would not only be a huge mistake to close down accesses to Current River you would be closing down access to my family's history. So much

of my family has camped down on Current River, we were raised to respect the River and to take care of it. It is people like us that will be more than devastated if the River accesses are closed. Please understand that Current River is more than just a place to us, it is a part of us and who we are.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 447    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,20,2013 12:02:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I THINK THE PLAN DOSE NOT TAKE THE LOCAL PEOPLE INTO ACCOUNT. I LIVE 3MI. FROM THE RIVER AND USE THE IT ALMOST DAILY. I PICK UP TRASH THAT THE TOURIST LEAVE EVERY TIME I SPEND TIME AT THE RIVER.

FOR MY EFFORTS, THE PARK SERVICE HAS TURNED THE PUBLIC WATER SYSTEM OFF, AND DOSE NOT KEEP THE GRASS CUT IN THE CAMPING AREAS. AND NOW YOU WANT TO KEEP ME FROM CAMPING ON THE GRAVEL BAR, BUT THE TOURIST CAN FLOAT THE RIVER AND LEAVE THEIR TRASH FOR US BOATERS TO CLEAN UP.

EVERY TIME YOU COME WITH A NEW "PLAN", IT SEEMS THAT IT ONLY RESTRICT MY USE OF A RIVER THAT HAS BEEN A PART OF LIFE FOR THE PAST 64 YEARS.

PLEASE DO US NO MORE DAMMAGE, AND LEAVE THE RIVER ALONE.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 448    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,20,2013 12:03:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think the best option is alternative B. It seems to strike a balance. I lived in Eminence for over 20 years, and the rivers are a resource to be protected.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 449    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,20,2013 13:35:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have canoed, fished, and camped in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways on a number of occasions while visiting family in the region. It is a spectacular place that is worthy of wise management and conservation for living Americans and future generations. As a forester by profession, I know the importance of developing and implementing management plans to guide the utilization and conservation of our natural resources.

Alternative B of the proposed General Management Plan for Ozark National Scenic Riverways appears to provide a balanced approach for the management of the outstanding natural and cultural resources along the Riverways. I support this alternative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 450    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,20,2013 13:59:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I STRONGLY support the NO ACTION PLAN. I do not want the boats removed from the rivers, rivers access closed or the camping sites closed.  
I have grew up and been on the river my entire life. It has been a very big part of my life and family as well. I would be extremely devastated if we were not able to do this any longer. I am 23 years old and do not have kids yet, but I want my kids to have the same privileges I had. The river is the best thing about the summers around here and it would be absolute disgrace if someone took this privilege away from us. So just to sum up my point, please do not take the rivers away from us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 451    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,20,2013 14:11:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Missouri has such amazing wild areas and this area is one of the most beautiful. I am hoping that you will do all you can to conserve it so it can be enjoyed by all of us and many future generations to come

---

**Correspondence ID:** 452    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,20,2013 17:06:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We are in favor of the no-action alternative.

The river is currently well managed, providing an excellent balance of ecology along with ready access to those who wish to enjoy the river.

The Plan A, B, and C may all have basically good intentions, but are dangerous in their interpretation. Often bureaucratic oversight results in unintended consequences of denying the local people, in fact all citizens, from enjoying a natural resource that belongs to all of us.

We now have a good balance. The other plans will introduce tighter controls which will rob the average citizen of enjoying the river and the surrounding natural habitats.

We propose no change.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 453    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,20,2013 17:06:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We want no action taken to restrict Current River more than it already is. Higher horsepower on a boat would actually be a good thing since we could haul more people in a boat= less boats on the river. The 60/40 jet is just barely satisfactory. River accesses must be left alone and kept open WITHOUT charging the public to use them. Double taxation is what you are doing when you charge for campsites and river access-especially when there is no water or electricity provided. I pay my taxes for the Park Service to do their daily duties, I should never have to pay to enter a NATIONAL PARK.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 454    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,20,2013 17:10:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I feel that motorized boats be permitted on the upper Current River to the headwaters in assisting injured people in canoes or inner tubes.

Gigging of fish(suckers) using motor boats is an Ozark Mountain tradition along with small mouth bass and trout fishing that needs to be kept open.

Motorized boats were used on Current and Jacks Fork River before the National Park Service was established. In fact, this is a part of our culture that dates back to the 1040's.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 455    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,20,2013 18:55:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
A Simple Statement

I ride. That seems like such a simple statement. However as many women who ride know it is really a complicated matter. It has to do with power and empowerment. Being able to do things one might have considered out of reach or ability. I have considered this as I shovel manure, fill water barrels in the cold rain, wait for the vet/farrier/electrician/hay delivery, change a tire on a horse trailer on the side of the freeway or cool a gelding out before getting down to the business of drinking a cold beer after a long ride.

The time, the money, the effort it takes to ride calls for dedication. At least I call it dedication. Both my ex-husbands call it 'the sickness'. It is a sickness I've had since I was a small girl bouncing my model horses and dreaming of the

day I would ride a real horse. Most of the women I ride with understand the meaning of 'the sickness'. It's not a sport. It's not a hobby. It's what we do and, in some ways, who we are as women and human beings.

I ride. I hook up my trailer and load my gelding. I haul to some trailhead somewhere, unload, saddle, whistle up my dog and I ride. I breathe in the air, watch the sunlight filter through the trees and savor the movement of my horse. My shoulders relax. A smile rides my sunscreen smeared face. I pull my ball cap down and let the real world fade into the tracks my horse leaves in the dust.

Time slows. Flying insects buzz loudly, looking like fairies. My gelding flicks his ears and moves down the trail. I can smell his sweat and it is perfume to my senses. Time slows. The rhythm of the walk and the movement of the leaves become my focus. My saddle creaks and the leather rein in my hand softens with the warmth.

I consider the simple statement; I ride. I think of all I do because I ride. Climb granite slabs, wade into a freezing lake, race a friend through the manzanita all the while laughing and feeling my heart in my chest. Other days just the act of mounting and dismounting can be a real accomplishment. Still I ride, no matter how tired or how much my seat bones or any of the numerous horse related injuries hurt. I ride. And I feel better for doing so.

The beauty I've seen because I ride amazes me. I've ridden out to find lakes that remain, for the most part, unseen. Caves, dark and cold, beside rivers full and rolling are the scenes I see in my dreams. The Granite Staircase at Echo Summit, bald eagles on the wing and bobcats on the prowl add to the empowerment and joy in my heart.

I think of the people, mostly women, I've met because I ride. I consider how competent they all are. Not a weenie among the bunch. We haul 40 foot rigs, we back into tight spaces without clipping a tree. We set up camp. Tend the horses. Cook and keep safe. We understand and love our companions; the horse. We respect each other and those we encounter on the trail. We know that if you are out there riding, you also shovel, fill, wait, and doctor. Your hands are a little rough and you travel without makeup or hair gel. You do without to afford 'the sickness' and probably, when you were a small girl, you bounced a model horse while you dreamed of riding a real one.

Julia Dake©  
2006

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	456	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,20,2013 18:59:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please leave the parks open to equestrians/add more trails/campgrounds for equestrians.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	457	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,20,2013 20:15:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello! I am an avid equestrian. My joy is getting out into the woods and riding with my friends. Really, it's my therapy...maybe my sanity! Please, please don't take away our right to ride the trails. We're the people that LOVE the woods and explore the woods and parks. If we can do things to help maintain the trails, or get along better with other groups... PLEASE give us a chance. Thanks for the opportunity to comment! Sharon				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	458	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,20,2013 20:15:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I trail ride in my home state and often travel to other states to ride. This is my only hobby. Please allow me to continue to RIDE.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	459	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,20,2013 20:48:18				

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you thank you for allowing me to ride in our National Parks. I can not believe how blessed I am to be able to have access to these beautiful parks. So very grateful. My friends and I are always very respectful of our parks. We NEVER leave trash and usually pick up trash as we see it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 460 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,21,2013 09:44:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please consider equestrians in your park plans. They are a vital part of the user groups in National Parks and need to be included. Horses a billion dollar business in this country and will bring tax and tourist dollars into the area while gaining the support of dedicated users of the national parks programs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 461 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,21,2013 11:44:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have made many canoe and backpack trips on the NPS Ozark National Scenic Riverways; several in 2012 and 2013 and dating back to the mid 80's.

I have noticed the obvious decrease in water quality on the Jacks Fork from my visits in the 90's.

Please work to keep ATV and horse usage to a minimum near the waterways.

Please close and patrol all unauthorized roads/trails.

Please limit jetboats and large HP motors!!! These are very dangerous on these small streams. I have experienced my canoe almost swamped by a jetboat speeding around a blind curve.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 462 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,21,2013 11:47:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern: I would prefer to have the plan from 2009 that would limit the boat motors to 25hp above the Van Buren gap and 40hp below, but seeing that this is not an option, I would have to ask for Plan A as the best that could be hoped for. Thank you, Mark

---

**Correspondence ID:** 463 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,21,2013 12:03:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern: The alternative option I would like to have is Plan "A". Thank you. Linda Kloessner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 464 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,21,2013 19:10:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment. The NPS preferred alternative B seems reasonable; however, please be advised that the continuation of traditional uses, particularly hunting, trapping and fishing as provided by the Wildlife Code of Missouri must be included and protected within the park.

Sincerely,

R. Kenneth Drenon

Conservation Federation of Missouri Board, Missouri Trappers Association delegate to CFM

---

**Correspondence ID:** 465 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,22,2013 16:36:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please leave the regulations as they are. The area is



beautiful and should be open to all. Focus should be on those that are trashing the streams and rivers and acting indecently in public.

Just enforce the laws that exist.

Sincerely,

Vicky J Church

---

**Correspondence ID:** 466    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,22,2013 18:09:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The horse is referred as what? Closing trails to horses is just one more nail in the coffin of the natural rider who may show once in awhile and who has loved,owned and cared for the horse since they were used in every day life as transportation. How absurd that trails are closed to horses and opened to atvs' when the natural environment is not harmed by horses.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 467    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,23,2013 07:57:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

On behalf of Environment Missouri more than 13,000 supporters, activists, and members, we applaud the National Park Service for releasing a draft General Management Plan that offers the potential for the restoration and protection of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and we urge them to adopt Alternative "NO-Action" in lieu of their preferred alternative.

The draft GMP that the NPS has released shows that they've heard what we've known for years-that the vast majority of Missourians think that the Current and Jacks Fork rivers deserve the protection and preservation that the NPS promised when they established the park. We urge the NPS to make their first priority in choosing an alternative the restoration of the Current and Jacks Fork to their 1964 conditions. We urge them to focus on preserving the wild nature of the rivers and traditional Ozarks heritage, as well as fostering deeper communication and understanding between park staff, the locals, and the people who travel from around the world to enjoy the park's spectacular beauty.

We urge the NPS to adopt Alternative "No-Action", which provides the strongest protections for the rivers and does the most to establish deeper, more meaningful connections between the NPS, the region, and the park's visitors.

Remember NO-Action is the only action needed to save the river's.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 468    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,23,2013 13:02:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I fully support the rational compromise that is Alternative B, with one addition: Alcohol use in the Ozark NSR should be banned.

The excessive use of alcohol on the rivers is probably the largest problem the park faces. The area has developed a reputation as the Daytona Beach of the Midwest where people can drink to excess and behave in any manner without fear of consequences. Incidences of public nudity, abusive and foul language directed at family groups including young women and girls, assaults, vandalism, and alcohol related fights and injuries are all increasingly commonplace on the river.

As a park employee responsible for managing public information, including our main telephone information line, I

hear many comments about the issue. Calls from visitors concerned about coming down to the park due to the parks reputation as a party center are increasing. Unable to tell them with confidence that they will be safe from harassment, or that they will truly experience a family friendly atmosphere, I tell them they are better off coming during the week or during the off season. Sadly, I can no longer in good conscience recommend family groups float the rivers on summer weekends. I will not knowingly expose my children to that environment, nor suggest others do.

There have been suggestions about means for limiting alcohol consumption, such as limiting the size of coolers floaters may have. These will be circumvented. The only real solution is a comprehensive alcohol ban on the rivers and in the campgrounds. To those who are only having an occasional beer and are not looking to get drunk, it is only the loss of one beverage choice. (They weren't going to get drunk anyway, so what's really the difference between beer and soda?) To those looking to bring their beer bong and Jello-shots, they may be encouraged to go elsewhere. If not, the law enforcement staff has clear cause to cite them, without any subjective judgments as to what is disorderly conduct or just fun.

It has been argued that an alcohol ban would have a detrimental effect on local businesses. Possibly so, but this is short term thinking. With the behavior situation under control, and good press about how the rivers were taken back from the drunken mobs, more affluent family groups would return to the area. The park, and concessionaires should undertake a positive spin publicity campaign after the ban is in place. Targeted at family groups, advertising by concessionaires and press releases by the park, would quickly spread the word of the changed atmosphere. This would remind families who no longer visit that we are again welcoming them. Family groups have a higher per capita spending rate than the extended peer groups who now come to party. They are more likely to purchase souvenirs, stay in motels and Bed & Breakfasts and eat in restaurants. Currently family groups are increasingly avoiding the park. Inviting them back would only make good economic sense.

I believe that a park superintendent has the authority to do this, as stated in Rock Creek Parks website:

Park Superintendent, by authority of 36 CFR 2.35 (3)(I), may close all or a portion of a public use area or public facility within a park to the consumption of alcoholic beverages.  
(<http://www.nps.gov/archive/rocr/justificationetoh.htm>)

There is much precedence for alcohol bans in national parks:

Cuyahoga Valley National Park: Alcohol banned  
Isle Royale National Park: Alcohol banned in campgrounds and boat docks  
Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area: Alcohol banned Memorial Day weekend  
Siuslaw National Forest: Alcohol banned in backcountry  
National Mall, Washington DC: Alcohol banned  
Delaware Water Gap: Banned in PA section, restricted from several areas in NJ  
Cumberland Gap NHP: Alcohol is allowed at individual camp sites but not permitted in public areas or buildings within the park.  
Steamtown NHS: Alcohol banned  
John Muir NHS: Alcohol banned  
Great Falls Park: Alcohol banned  
Andrew Johnson NHS: Alcohol banned  
Petrified Forest NM: Only allowed in restaurants and picnic areas  
Indiana Dunes NL: Alcohol banned at beaches  
Wisconsin State Parks: Alcohol ban  
Kansas State parks: Alcohol ban on all recreational lakes  
Michigan State Parks: Alcohol ban in 27 state parks  
Illinois State Parks: Alcohol ban in 53 state parks  
Parks Canada: Banned alcohol during three day weekend nationwide  
(also instituted by all Provincial parks during same period)

Some voices say that the public won't support an alcohol ban in the park, however, a survey of some 7,000

Americans by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation found that 63% sport banning alcohol from public parks and 53% sport banning alcohol from public beaches and campgrounds. (<http://www.cspinet.org/booze/rwjfsurvey.htm>)

In order for Ozark NSR to ever return to a positive, resource oriented national park experience for visitors, alcohol must be banned, and that new policy must be widely promoted in the media. Half measures will only exacerbate the problems. If allowed to continue for another decade, the rivers will be so trashed and the area have such a poor reputation, that the situation may not be salvageable.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 469    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,23,2013 13:10:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Alternative B seems to be the best way to balance competing park uses. All uses have the potential to infringe on other uses, such as my experience hiking with jetboats.

One early spring day while hiking in the proposed Wilderness area near Big Spring, I heard a most distressing sound: a low whine that grew louder and louder. I recognized this as the sound of a jetboat on the Current River a couple of miles away. I know that completely banning jetboats would never be politically feasible, but people who think they do not affect either others' enjoyment of the park or the riparian ecosystem are badly mistaken.

That loud whine definitely degraded my experience that day. More importantly, the exhaust, which is mixed with the water by jet power units pollutes the water, as does the inevitable sheen of oil coming off of those motors. Unless you are on the very upper stretches of the river, there is no escaping the sound. The wildlife that had the misfortune of being born on the Lower Current has no choice. The aquatic organisms, the fish the anglers seek, as well as the macro-invertebrates and microorganisms their food chains are based on are also adversely affected by the sound, pollution and wave action of the boats.

Similar arguments could be made regarding horses, which create 60 pounds of waste per day, ATVs, and unnecessary backcountry roads. These uses, and others, are all having a degrading impact on Ozark Riverways' resources right now.

The National Park Service is charged with preserving its areas "unimpaired for future generations" and only allowing uses that leave the resources unimpaired. The Redwood Act was very clear about which comes first, and it's the unimpaired preservation of resources. Uses such as jetboats, allowing motor vehicles to cross the river, tolerating huge numbers of horses and the like are a clear violation of the charge the NPS was given when it was given stewardship over the rivers in 1964.

The park needs to take its responsibilities seriously, without regard to the inevitable negative public feedback. Comedian Bill Cosby once said: "the key to failure is trying to please everybody." The park should be guided by one simple rule: do right. Our mission, as laid out in the Organic Act, the Redwoods Act and the park's Enabling Legislation is quite clear: to preserve these rivers and their environs unimpaired for future generations. If we keep going down the same road we have been going, future generations will only inherit a muddy creek amid eroded and stripped hills. As the younger folk say, "let's not go there."

---

**Correspondence ID:** 470    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,23,2013 13:26:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Alternative B, which I fully support, indicates and increased attention to natural resources management and the scientific underpinnings of how we do this.

Ozark NSR has no legislative obligation to maintain open fields, either as Cultural Landscapes or as artificially enhanced hunting areas. However, the NPS does have an obligation to preserve native wildlife populations. Forest fragmentation has been shown to be a cause of neotropical songbird decline in the United States. The increased edge effect of cleared areas makes predation easier, as well as encourages populations of the brown-headed cowbird, a ruthless nest parasite. (See quote below from Audubon Society website)

Large blocks of unbroken forest are being shattered into increasingly smaller fragments, allowing such meso-

predators as crows, jays, raccoons, possums, feral cats and fox to prey on once-secure migrant song bird nests. In addition, increasingly fragmented forests have enabled the brown-headed cow bird to colonize areas they once would have found unattractive.

Cowbirds live at the edge of forests and feed in farms fields and pastures. Though native to North America, the brown-headed cowbird was once confined to the forest edges of Midwestern prairies where they fed in grasslands grazed by roaming bison. Today, however, because of widespread forest fragmentation, parasitic cowbirds can be found all across the United States. ([http://www.audubon.org/campaign/population\\_habitat/sprawl.html](http://www.audubon.org/campaign/population_habitat/sprawl.html))

Also, the Ozark NSR has an obligation to acknowledge the vital role forested river corridors play in songbird ecology. To quote an NPS publication, Park Science:

Riparian corridors may be of critical importance to the maintenance of healthy bird populations. Some species may benefit from a contiguous transition from lowland riparian to upland mixed hardwoods. ([http://www2.nature.nps.gov/parksci/vol21/vol21\(1\)/09-3gardali.GOGA.html](http://www2.nature.nps.gov/parksci/vol21/vol21(1)/09-3gardali.GOGA.html))

The edge effect created by open fields is considered to be beneficial to game species, but may decrease overall biodiversity and use of the area by declining species, such as migrant songbirds. Note information from the University of Virginia:

However, not all wildlife is suited to edge habitat, and the deliberate construction of large amounts of edge has been contested by some wildlife biologists. They are concerned that an abundance of edge may cause reproductive failure, restriction of range, loss of genetic variability, and mortality for species that have very specific habitat requirements (Harris 1988, Wigley and Roberts 1997). (<http://www.ext.vt.edu/pubs/forestry/420-152/420-152.html>)

Based on this information, and the NPS mission to preserve parks unimpaired for future generations, most open fields and agricultural permit areas within the park should be encouraged to revert to forest. The Ozark NSR should not be managed in a way detrimental to songbird populations for the benefit of an increasingly small number of recreationists (hunters)\* or on the basis of obscure academic interests few visitors are concerned about, the so-called cultural landscapes.

The park can fulfill its Legislative obligations to protect historic objects without preserving these open areas as cultural landscapes. To maintain a true cultural landscape indicative of the time era the park interprets would also require the virtual denuding of the hills since at the turn of the 20th century the forests were decimated and the addition of both intact and derelict farm equipment and structures.

The surrounding rural countryside and Mark Twain National Forest, as well as state conservation lands offer ample opportunities for hunting. The use of bottomlands in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways that best reflects the mission and value of the National Park Service, is to encourage all areas to grow up in river cane, bottomland forest and other natural vegetation.

#### NOTES:

\*According to US Fish and Wildlife Service, from 1991 to 2001 the number of hunters in the United States decreased by 7% ([tp://library.fws.gov/nat\\_survey2001\\_trends.pdf](http://library.fws.gov/nat_survey2001_trends.pdf)) However, the number of people who enjoy birdwatching has steadily increased. The following is from the testimony of Mike Daulton of the Audubon Society in support of the Neotropical Bird Conservation Improvement Act on June 23, 2005:

These birders, out to spot Neotropical migrants, can provide a significant boost for local economies during the migration periods. In fact, according to the US Fish and Wildlife Service, in 2001 46 million birders spent \$32 billion on pursuing their interest in bird and wildlife watching. Birders spend money on equipment, birding trips and vacations, bird food, park fees, hotels, food, and more. More than 18 million people take trips specifically for bird watching. These trips alone account for a staggering \$7.4 billion in spending by bird watchers each year. Overall, these purchases have a ripple effect in the economy that leads to a total of \$85 billion in economic benefit and generates more than 800,000 jobs, according to the Fish and Wildlife Service.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 471      **Project:** 15793      **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,23,2013 13:34:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Alternative B seems to be the best of the alternative GMPs for properly managing the park's natural resources. The narrative seems to indicate that the natural resources would be managed more in line with national NPS policies and "best practices" in the field. In line with this intent, trout stocking should cease immediately

The deliberate introduction of non-native trout to the Current River is contrary to NPS policies, goals, practices and values. As large aquatic predators, they must be having some negative impact on the aquatic ecosystem, which can no longer be assumed to even resemble the original system in which bass were presumably the top predator among fish species. One cant help but wonder if there is a correlation between continuing stocking of trout and the decline of Ozark hellbenders (an endangered species) in the Upper Current. A study by Alex Avery of the Hudson institute implicates introduced trout in hellbender decline:

"In Missouri, concern over the recent and rapid decline in the number of Ozark hellbender salamanders has led to a flurry of research into the possible role of an agricultural pollutant or other so-called endocrine disruptor. Yet extensive dams built in the region have massively altered and destroyed the Ozark hellbenders habitat. These impacts are magnified by the fact that Ozarks hellbenders live for decades and dont reproduce until they are 5-7 years old. Moreover, the Ozark hellbenders have no instinctual fear of predatory trout. Trout were never historically in the Ozark hellbenders range, but have now been purposefully introduced throughout." ([www.hudson.org/files/publications/Frogs and Pesticides Final.pdf](http://www.hudson.org/files/publications/Frogs%20and%20Pesticides%20Final.pdf))

The NPS as a whole is aware of the impact of exotic fish stocking and is beginning to address it, as evidence from information on the NPS Fisheries website:

"Often new species were brought into an area and introduced into lakes or streams with hopes of increasing the number and diversity of fish available. As our scientific understanding and knowledge of natural ecosystems has progressed, managers of protected natural areas have come to realize that the introduction of fish species that are not native to the area results in harmful impacts to the natural ecology of the aquatic system. Native species are often out competed by the introduced fish species and become greatly reduced in number or even lost from the system completely. Food organisms may be over consumed and the natural balance of other aquatic organisms present will likely be changed." ([http://www1.nrintra.nps.gov/wrd/fisheries/native\\_species.cfm](http://www1.nrintra.nps.gov/wrd/fisheries/native_species.cfm)) Emphasis added.

ONSR should get with the program nationally. The website cited above continues:

"Today the National Park Service no longer stocks fish in natural areas but instead relies on natural reproduction and careful management of fishing activities to sustain fish populations and fishing opportunities. However, early stocking practices have left the parks with many areas in which non-native fish continue to dominate and displace the native species. Elimination of these non-native species is not possible in many cases, but where possible, the NPS is working to remove the non-native species and reintroduce or restore the native species to help reestablished the natural aquatic ecosystem."

All the park needs to do is simply stop. The trout do not reproduce well by all accounts. In time the population would die out. Of course, stopping MDCs stocking of a Federal river would be legally easy - its already a violation of several laws and regulations, but politically difficult, as anglers are powerful lobby.

Allowing the introduction of trout may be prohibited under several applicable laws, such as Executive Order 13112 - Invasive species, which states:

"federal agencies cannot authorize, fund, or carry out actions that it believes are likely to cause or promote the introduction or spread of invasive species in the United States or elsewhere unless all reasonable measures to minimize risk of harm have been analyzed and considered."

Also: Executive Order 11987, Exotic Organisms. 42 FR 26949 (May 25, 1977)

"Federal agencies shall discourage the States from introducing exotic species into natural ecosystems of the United States. In addition, Federal agencies will restrict the use of Federal funds for the purpose of introducing exotic species into ecosystems outside of the United States."

Seems like we could do this if the new GMP simply stated the park was going to go by the book in adopting NPS policies. The park could say sorry MDC, our hands are tied&

---

**Correspondence ID:** 472 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,23,2013 14:46:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to express my support for Alternative B. While it doesn't address all the concerns I have regarding the future of this park, it does seem to strike a reasonable middle ground. No plan is going to please everyone, but this seems to have the ingredients for good long term stewardship of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

Horse use has long been identified as a recreational use that can be detrimental if not properly managed. Re-routing trails and changing from "homemade" trails to horse trails that are engineered and laid out by professionals can only be a positive development. While visitors wish to enjoy the view of the river, moving trails away from the riverbanks should help control erosion. Reducing river crossings will help control turbidity as well as reduce potential conflicts with floaters and boaters. Properly done, trail riding can be a worthwhile recreational activity that gets visitors out into the resource with little impact. However, riders need to be informed of the detrimental effects of erosion caused by informal trails and turbidity caused by frequent river crossings.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 473 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,23,2013 14:48:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Alternative B as the most reasonable compromise Plan. Please continue to keep a lid on ATV use in the park. It is my understanding that off road travel and travel by ATVs on park owned roads has always been prohibited. I have had the experience of having ATVs come roaring through my camp (at Troublesome Hollow) late at night, with little regard to my children's safety. They tore up the creek bed and generally raised a drunken ruckus before retreating into the night. Besides the inevitable environmental damage, we simply do not need that sort of behavior in a "family friendly park." This damage is evident if you hike into the Cave Spring / Devils Well area, where unsightly informal rutted ATV trails crisscross the area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 474 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,23,2013 14:57:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Alternative B in part because of its commitment to increasing hiking opportunities in the park. The river is sometimes "up" as we say and therefore closed to boating of any kind. Many visitors who have made their reservations and arrive only to be told they can't float are disappointed. The park needs more land based recreational activities to give folks more to do and a reason to stay in the area on flood days. Currently there are few hiking opportunities in the park, and the existing ones are not convenient to major campgrounds. Each major campground should have a network of trails, perhaps an easy short one, a longer moderate one and a spur that would connect to the Ozark Trail for the serious hiker.

Also, "hike and float" opportunities could be developed wherein a person might hike a moderately long trail to a canoe rental location, rent a canoe and then return via river to his/her car at a trailhead. This might be very popular in the cooler spring and fall when the local communities could appreciate the increased tourism dollars.

Lastly the park should encourage backpacking. While the Ozark Trail is a backpacking trail, there is nowhere backpackers can camp off trail legally, except on gravel bars and developed campsites. Perhaps the park needs to develop or designate a few small camping areas along the trail for this user group.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 475 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,24,2013 07:06:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to see less human activity on the Current river- -smaller motors for boats & fewer landings for humans & Horses; a 25 horse powered motor would suffice on such a small stream as the Current river. The canoe & tube rentals also need to have less power & more regulations. Thank You, Dennis J Smith

---

**Correspondence ID:** 476 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,24,2013 09:42:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We have visited Eminence and floated the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers several times. We love the area and want to see it remain protected. After reading all the alternatives, I believe the recommended plan is nearly perfect. I would like to see these items happen:

Close illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;  
Close 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings;  
Bar vehicle access to gravel bars.  
We would also like to see more hiking trails for people.

Good luck and we look forward to many more years experiencing the beauty of this area.

Sincerely,

Lori Green  
Villa Ridge, MO

---

**Correspondence ID:** 477 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,24,2013 10:16:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** ATV's should not be allowed in the park boundaries.Horse back riding should definitely be limited. Horses should not be allowed to enter streams.They are a major cause of stream pollution.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 478 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,24,2013 11:36:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** as a local resident me and my family spent a lot of our time on current river , we fish, gig, and swim and love the way the river is now being regulated...we do not think that there should be any changes made to the current regulations, especially adding any more restrictions....I want my children and grandchildren to be able to enjoy our scenic riverways as i have...thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 479 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,25,2013 12:31:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please consider the comparative cost of getting a horse to a trail ride as opposed to hiking. I am a trail rider. We ride many multi use trails all over the country. St. Charles County MO has recently developed multiuse parks and included hikers, bicycles, and horses. Please talk to them about incorporating different users into trail instead of restricting them. All share the trails very well. We did pass, a law in MO that requires replacing every mile of trail removed from use with equal trail. Also consider the history of the area with Jesse James riding many of the same trails used today along the current river. Please consider the serious financial impact on the area and the investment made by trail riders in our sport/hobby. We are more than happy to share the trails available. Also the simple inequity of restricting one constituent's use of the trails over another is definitely not in keeping with basic fairness and equal protection for all of the citizenry.  
Thank you for your time and consideration.  
Diane Jones

---

**Correspondence ID:** 480 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,25,2013 21:07:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It is my opinion that the rivers should be left as they are! We local people enjoy going there to camp, canoe, swim, etc. Since they are public rivers to be enjoyed by all, and especially local tax payers who treat the rivers with care, we do not want the government telling us when or where we can enjoy our public rivers!

Our area would also hurt from lack of tourist who enjoy our rivers. Several businesses rely on the summer to bring money into our area as means of survival.

The motor boats are not harming the rivers! There again, money is brought into our area by these people enjoying the rivers. They do shopping in town for gas, food, lodging etc. and that also would hurt the economy of the area if they could not use the rivers for recreation.

Bottom line.....leave them alone!

Glen Edgar

---

**Correspondence ID:** 481 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,26,2013 11:01:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Lets leave these rivers wild and scenic so that people can enjoy time away from the hustle and bustle of their everyday lives.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 482 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,27,2013 09:02:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The no-action plan should be the plan used. The NPS and Riverways haven't shown by past actions that they're "recommendations" have been in the best interest of any community. The plans A,C, and even (B - The preferred plan)

are only a plan to limit use of the rivers by locals. Hunters and fisherman and campers, use these rivers and gravel bars and access points for they're recreation too. Motor boats have already been limited on both rivers but the amount of canoes and tubes and horse trails haven't been. Canoes and tubes are put on these rivers at an alarming rate each day in "Peak Season" and they pollute the waters and gravel bars with trash, feces, and bottles. Not to mention all the drugs that they smoke, shoot, and swallow along the way. Motor boats are not the cause of bank erosion like some suggest but it is caused by trails being made into the woods for lots of reasons unmaintained horse trails, game trails, unmaintained boat landings, but the biggest cause of bank erosion is that the stream channel is not cleaned out... when storms or whatever falls trees into the rivers blocking the channel. That then starts a gravel deposit narrowing the passage and eventually another gravel bar altering the river channel. So maybe the NPS should look into a plan that includes cleaning out the rivers giving outdoorsmen and fishermen the same access as the canoe and tube outfitters that are cramming these rivers full weekly.

So far the plans A,B, and C that I have read are only interested in limiting motor boating and vehicle accesses. maybe we should limit how many canoes and tubes can be released daily. limit horse trails to not be within 100 ft. of river bank, and pooper scoops for the horse feces and walking trails. fence it off so the wild deer, elk, otters and other animals can't damage the banks. Let it fill up with dead fall trees, it is almost that way now. Sound silly? So does your plans A, B, and C...

---

**Correspondence ID:** 483 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,27,2013 19:29:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Alternative B adversely affects the economy of the surrounding communities by closing roads and access points that prevent visitors from enjoying the crystal clear waters of the Ozark Mountains. Visitation and resulting revenues of tourist related businesses are suffering as a result.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 484 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,27,2013 19:44:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Having a handicapped son, I feel that Alternative B does not provide for recreational



opportunities for people with special needs or the elderly. We hunt, fish, gig, canoe, kayak and own a jet boat. The closing of roads and access points make it impossible for people with special needs to enjoy the rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 485    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,27,2013 20:25:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hunting,fishing, gigging and trapping on the upper Current River will be limited due to restrictions on outboard motor and closure of roads and on the upper Current River. These traditions are important to culture of the Ozark Mountain People.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 486    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,28,2013 07:13:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I understand the Park Service's desire to keep the Ozark area protected from pollution and destruction. However, in doing so you are going to be keeping our children from falling in love with mountains, water and animals that you are so desperately trying to protect. It is those who are in love with this area that care for it. I understand there are many who just use and abuse the land that they are enjoying. These people are not in love with the land and therefore do not take care of it. Please do not take away the opportunities for our children to engage in the natural and beautiful Ozarks, creating a deep connection, because of those who do wrong. It would be like not allowing anyone to drive on the roads because of the sins of drunk drivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 487    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,28,2013 13:44:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family has floated the Jacks and Current rivers for many years. The three biggest changes to bring about an enhanced visit would be the following. First, no alcohol on the stream. This practice encourages a lot of foolish to dangerous behavior. In camp is ok subject to the current limits. No motor boats above Powder Mill on the weekends from the Thursday before Memorial day to Labor day. Third, no ATVs!!! Nothing spoils a visit like the smells and sounds of high engine rpm whining.

The Park Service should also disclose which access points are being considered for closure and/or upgrade/downgrade and/or new access. Gravel bar camping should be continued to be allowed but with permit. This would attach some responsibility for trash.

Lastly, it must also be recognized that it is unlikely that the park service budgets will be increased going forward. Therefore any proposals that require extra funding must be avoided.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 488    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,28,2013 16:18:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As an avid paddler, and a person experienced in Swift Water Rescue. I would suggest that the shut down of the USGS gauge at Aker's Ferry should not be closed, as this will affect many local businesses and outfitters that depend on a reliable gauge for current river levels. Not only is this an important gauge for outfitters and paddlers that travel to the area on this very popular river system, but it is a safety issue as well. Without a reliable gauge, people may travel to the area, not knowing just how much water/or rain fall has happened in the area locally, and this can be a huge safety issue for those floating the river, and for those camping on gravel bars. I think there are some rivers or creeks that are much less popular where closing a gauge would have much less of an impact.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 489    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,28,2013 17:40:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am posting this to inform you that I would like the no change policy. I have lived in the Bunker, Missouri area for the biggest part of my life and have raised my children enjoying our family vacations on the Current River. It has been a family tradition of my husband's family and we have carried it on with ours. We are a middle income family that does not get to enjoy the leisure of traveling around the US for family vacations, therefore, we have been blessed with getting to spend our summers on the Current River. I would hate to see this

taken away from my family, my children and my grandchildren. It is my sincere hope and prayer that you leave this beautiful country and river to those of us who truly enjoy spending our time there, that is why that I am requesting you invoke the NO CHANGE POLICY. Thank you for your time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 490    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,29,2013 05:30:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** i appreciate the opportunity to comment on the considerations of this new plan.

My family and i have been enjoying the many activites that the ONSR(ozark national scenic riverways) have allowed for almost 40 years. We have fished, floated, camped, rode horses and ATVs throughout the area.

My main concern with the proposed changes is the additional closure of access road as well as access to gravel bars on the river. These closures would greatly reduce our enjoyment of the river as both my wife and i are disabled and have little use of hiking trails and buffer zone which restrict our access to the river.

At this stage in my life as a impaired senior citizen, I/we utilize our ATV vehicles to take us to the river for camping and fishing. These new regulations would drastically reduce our access to our favorite spots on the river.

I would hope that consideration of ADA principles would be considered and that our rights to access these public areas would not be restricted through unfair regulations.

If these measures are pursued to restrict the rights of access for the disabled, our rights will be violated and we will have to seek a remedy through the judicial system to ensure that these rights are upheld for everyone.

You may be walking today and one day maybe not. Can you imagine the dissappointment of be unable to reach your favorite gravel bar or site because it is only open to those who can still hike or walk on roads or trails that you have walked for your entire life.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 491    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,29,2013 05:47:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please don't change anything. Leave things just the way they are. Missouri does not need any more government intrusion. The NPS should be abolished. Parks do much better when managed by individual states. All land should be given back to the states.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 492    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,29,2013 07:30:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** the people living in these areas have a limited amount of time to earn an income. please get out of everyone else's bussiness.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 493    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,29,2013 07:52:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to have all motorized watercraft removed from all scenic rivers. They pollute the water and air and destroy the peaceful quality of the rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 494    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,29,2013 11:01:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not make any changes to our rivers. The goverment does not need to be involveled in our recreational areas.

The people most in favor of making these changes have never been to the areas involved.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 495 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,29,2013 11:56:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It is currently a poor excuse for a "wilderness" experience, but I encourage you to implement whatever restrictions are necessary to preserve this beautiful resource for future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 496 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,29,2013 18:31:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The closing of roads and access points on the Current River and Jacks Fork is detrimental to the safety of the public in receiving emergency medical help when needed quickly.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 497 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,29,2013 20:20:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Once again, it is time to step up for the future of our children and our planet-home. we need to honor and natural spaces for the ecology of mind and body and the creatures who thrive in these areas.

Work for a healthy future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 498 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,29,2013 22:28:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I read in the Kansas City Star that you are considering restricting camping on multi-day canoe trips to the backcountry campgrounds. Please reconsider this. The backcountry campgrounds are not patrolled as regularly and often become used by local "partiers" which does not lead to a peaceful outdoor experience. If the river is receiving too much use, it would be preferable to establish camping zones and restricting the number of parties as many parks do for backpacking. It would be a great shame to not be able to experience the true wilderness by camping out on the river bars at least once a summer. It is magical to sit alone by the river as the stars and fireflies come out at night. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 499 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,30,2013 07:50:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I want to thank the National Park Service for putting together such a well done plan & study.

I'm in favor of the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers.

Of most importance, Alternative A:

Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;  
Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings;  
Bars all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

The Current and Jacks Fork Rivers are so beautiful, and are a vary valuable natural asset that deserves as much protection as we can possibly give them. We need to keep our promise to future generations that the Ozarks National Scenic Riverways remain intact & unspoiled.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 500 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,30,2013 10:28:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** After the overwhelming opposition the the recent Blueways project I'm surprised the Parks Service would try to propose this plan. Were you not listening? The people do not want more government regulation of our land or waterways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 501 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,30,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Regarding the proposed General Management Plan (GMP) of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR), I have concerns that the National Park Service has not taken into great enough account the input from directly impacted citizens who live, use, and work along the Riverways.

We should provide citizens with a variety of recreational opportunities while continuing to preserve and protect the economic, natural, and cultural resources of the ONSR for future generations. The current proposals under the new GMP do not address my primary concern:

Tourism is one of the most critical components of our rural economy and the ONSR is the primary attraction. Thousands of out-of-state as well as in-state hikers, campers, boaters, hunters, fishermen and horseback riders visit this area annually and bring many irreplaceable dollars when they come. Any further limitations on the access to these assets would severely impact this local economy.

We must not overlook our citizens' heritage and livelihood.

Providing directly impacted citizens with an opportunity to have input on this critical issue is essential for the success and future management of the ONSR. The economic and cultural importance of the ONSR to families and small businesses in Missouri will be threatened if the "NPS Preferred Alternative" is implemented. It appears that the goal of this plan is to shut down public access points to the rivers, eliminate motorized boat traffic from certain areas, further restrict boat motor horsepower in other areas, close several gravel bars, and propose additional areas to be designated as federal wilderness. I am adamantly opposed to all of these proposals, as are our constituents and business owners.

I support the "No-Action Alternative" to the current operating system.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 502 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,30,2013 11:15:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the "No-Action Alternative" to the current operating system.

The ONSR value to the region is unparalleled. Do not adopt a GMP that is contrary to the wishes of my constituents and the other folks who depend on access to the Riverways and cannot operate with additional government regulations. In my opinion, the ONSR is already over-managed with burdensome federal regulations. The Riverways support a vibrant and growing tourism industry that is critical to our region and state.

I will continue to strongly advocate against further encroachment by the National Park Service limiting our citizens' access to public lands. As you continue with the process, I hope you will consider our comments and those of the directly impacted citizens who will be affected by your actions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 503 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,30,2013 13:00:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Most tax paying voters that I know, are so sick and tired of "THE GOVERNMENT" taking away our freedoms and rights, and taking CONTROL of ALL public lands, and waterways, that were donated or bought with tax payer dollars, for the publics use and enjoyment. Trying to change everything to satisfy our now communist leaders that have taken over this country. The communist and humanist organizations that don't even live in this part of the country. You're planning on having a meeting in Kirkwood, where they have a city mentality, and have very little knowledge of the day to day way of life of the country folk that live here. When the city folk come to our areas, they throw their trash everywhere, totally disrespect our way of life with their trash and crime, and ignorant driving, and expect us to change to their way of thinking. QUIT TRYING TO CHANGE OUR WAY OF LIFE! YOUR NOT IMPROVING A DAMN THING! ALL YOUR GOING TO DO IS CAUSE OUR TAXES TO RISE, AND HIRE MORE UNNECESSARY PEOPLE TO TRY TO CONTROL US, AND OUR USE OF OUR PUBLIC LANDS AND WATERWAYS, AND WHAT YOU ARE DOING IS MAKING EVERYONE ELSE

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	504	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,30,2013 14:08:07				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please leave things alone!! As a local to the area, my family and I do not want to see any changes made. Thank you.				
<hr/>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	505	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,30,2013 15:24:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Test				
<hr/>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	506	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,30,2013 16:57:35				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	1st Choice: No Action 2nd Choice Alternative B				
<hr/>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	507	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,30,2013 17:09:35				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I spend my weekends on current river which is close to my home. For over 40 years this has been my way of relaxation. The river is clean and peaceful, local citizens work to keep it this way. This river is part of the local culture and adds to the economy. Do not restrict and crowd people into certain areas with unnecessary rules and regulations. We have always taken care of our area and will continue to do so. NO ACTION!				
<hr/>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	508	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,30,2013 19:14:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	No Change!				
<hr/>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	509	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,30,2013 19:36:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am fully against ANY MORE RESTRICTIONS on properties that are acquired and maintained with tax payer dollars yet with very limited accessibility to the public. The debt ceiling limit has been raised twice within the past year but yet the National Park Service (NPS) wants to INCREASE THEIR budget 2.8 million. They will cost tourism and commercial jobs but will INCREASE THEIR employment roster by nearly one-half again. It is not just an NPS tactic but all Federal Government branches that present ridiculous proposals, one usually so ludicrous (Proposal "A") that the public fearing it will go through grudgingly accept a lesser evil (Proposals "B" and "C".) Any of the three will be a huge win for the NPS and their budget. My family and friends have enjoyed the Current River responsibly for years. I do not want a "designated" area for camping on the river bank. On an overnight float I don't want to have to speed up or set camp early to be at a designated camp. I also like camping with my family, not with everybody else's in a designated area. I do not understand wanting to remove horse trails from an area that boasts primitive wild horses other than wanting to limit equestrian riders access to the land that their tax dollars paid for. I guess the wild horses will have to be trained to only cross at the NPS approved crossings. As far as the proposed Big Springs Wilderness area, I have family that has property next to a wilderness area and when there is a fire threatening it the U.S. Forest Service workers request to use their dozer to cut fire lines on HIS property because if the fire gets on the wilderness area they cant use a dozer, chainsaw or even a motorized backpack blower to fight the fire. ENOUGH ALREADY!!				
<hr/>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	510	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208

**Received:** Dec,31,2013 00:55:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm in favor of Alternative A if it is an A,B,C choice. More restrictions on jet boats would be a plus.....Give the floaters a want to discover some of the water below the Jack's Fork for a change.....It is overrun with jackwagons' in jet boats on most weekends. I don't mind the folks that run up once and float back down....but the ones that run up and down all day long are a problem. Not friendly stretch for floaters...

Horses...I don't get down to the JF much, but keep the horse operator out of Parker Hollow. Think they had 30-50 horses down there when we pulled out after a float a couple years ago in January. Horse dung all over the place, and our vehicles were blocked in. Had to be an organized ride....but that does not belong there. The horses really rip the place up. Ok for private riders I guess...make them get a permit if it is over 10 or so..

Illegal roads and trails...Cedar to Akers is a disgrace....you cant walk 50 yards off the river without finding a two track 4x4 trail...I don't head down river from Akers in the winter, but I'm wondering just how bad it is.

Gavin Poppen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 511 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,31,2013 09:36:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe the way things are divided up along the current river and jacks fork is fair to everyone, floaters, boaters, horse's, back packers and the like. It is are park and does not need to be over managed like are fine government who only have are best interest in mind !

If for no other reasons we do not need more taxes and bigger government to run are lives !

Run away spending has to stop, these parks belong to everyone !

---

**Correspondence ID:** 512 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,31,2013 10:13:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Less spending and less government

NO ACTION

---

**Correspondence ID:** 513 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,31,2013 10:18:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm against more spending and more government !

Leave things alone !

NO ACTION !!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 514 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,31,2013 15:39:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Alternative A is preferred. These areas in the state are special and need the maximum protection from pollution related to horses,other livestock, crops, agriculture runoff, roads and other infrastructure/building, etc.

I have been canoeing on these rivers for several decades (since the 1970s) and have seen the deterioration! The NPS has done a good job evaluating the options/alternative. However, the horses and roads and ORVs have to be brought under control as they are ruining the natural beauty of these majestic rivers that are so clean and clear unlike any others in the state.

Please select the protective Alternative A; the other alternatives are not protective of the treasures these rivers represent to the people of Missouri and the rest of the country. We have so few natural places left especially of this high quality. It is your responsibility to protect these special places.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 515    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,31,2013 16:48:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** WE in Missouri are happy without The government interfereing. This is OUR STATE, GET OUT! How much plainer do you need to hear. I am sick of this whole administration! Go impose your feeble-minded ideas on Wash DC. You have too many people with nothing to do, except sit around and try to control all that we do. Right now, our troops are fighting for everyone elses freedom. While you are oppressing us. WAKE UP- the gov will manage you when you get finished. jb

---

**Correspondence ID:** 516    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,31,2013 17:22:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please, no change, leave the river-ways as is and find another way to clean it up. I know any time I ever rode horses on the Current River, I never littered. Any, and all trash I had, went back into my pack. I truly believe that the one's that are trashing the river-ways are the ones that don't live in these areas. I mean think about it, and of course I am only referring to horse/trail riders, we enjoy a clean undisturbed (trashed up) trail, so why would we be the one's that are doing the trashing of it. And as far as horses crossing the rivers causing any kind of damage, that is just ridiculous. Wild horses have always crossed the rivers and it has caused no harm in any way. Deer probably cross the rivers more often than horses. I believe that floaters, (canoe, kayak, tubes etc. are more to blame for trash left on the banks and slews on the river. Not all are careless, but it only takes a few to ruin it for everyone else.

There has just got be a better way to handle all of this, besides taking away more of our rights.

Sincerely,  
Shelby Shepherd

---

**Correspondence ID:** 517    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,31,2013 19:45:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** No action!

These are our parks and wilderness areas. We pay taxes for the use of these lands. I value these lands and realize you think you need to "protect" them but to what end? A park that no one may enter?

Why not just admit that budget cuts have made them too expensive to maintain so you're just going to close them all off to the public and say that you "did nothing wrong" in the making of your decision?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 518    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,01,2014 09:14:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It would be a huge devastation to the people if changes where made to the ozark national scenic riverway. It is one of the most beautiful places in Missouri. Please make no changes to the ozark national scenic riverway.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 519    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,01,2014 09:41:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please preserve the rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 520 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,01,2014 09:45:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As one concerned with ecological integrity and the opportunity for Americans and international citizens to enjoy pristine wild lands, I urge the NPS to make their first priority in choosing an alternative that will restore the Current and Jacks Fork to their 1964 conditions. I request that you adopt Alternative "A", which provides the strongest protections for the rivers and does the most to establish deeper, more meaningful connections between the NPS, the region, and the park's visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 521 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,01,2014 11:23:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm in favor of the no action plan.

I hike the area and canoe it yearly.

I find any 3 proposed plans too restrictive to those activities.

I also have concern for the economic effect on the river area.

The poor economy is already taking it's toll on this area.

More government regulations will further harm the areas economy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 522 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,01,2014 12:19:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a former NPS employee, I understand the need for a more cogent and comprehensive Management Plan. I am concerned, however, with several of the provisions as put forth in their chosen Alternative B. For one, the total exclusion of outboard motors on the Upper Current River and Jacks Fork. As a trapper and fisherman, I have friends who frequent these areas and there is no negligible conflict with other forms of recreation, especially in the off season months. Out board motors on johnboats precede the creation of the ONSR as well as the commercial canoe business on these waterways. Fishing would actually be hindered by the ever increasing otter population if trappers cannot access these areas by boat. There would be an extreme negative impact culturally and economically if these activities were stopped. I strongly advise that the NPS reconsider these suggested provisions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 523 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,01,2014 19:48:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of Plan A... We need to protect the few National Scenic Riverways from over use, misuse and abuse. Access should be via approved and maintained access areas, and restrict motor sizes to protect streambeds, riparian zones, and fish spawning areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 524 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,02,2014 09:46:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I agree with the NPS that Alternative B is the best plan. Keep up the good work!

Best Regards,

Bill Echols

---

**Correspondence ID:** 525 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,02,2014 11:21:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing as a concerned citizen of the state of Missouri regarding the effects the Ozark



National Scenic Riverways, new Draft General Management Plan, will have on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. Shutting down access points on these rivers will have devastating effects on our local economy. For decades, the people of Missouri have successfully maintained and preserved the health of the rivers and surrounding areas. Local folks are more than capable of ensuring the health of the rivers, while permitting the public to use and enjoy the land they pay to preserve. I strongly recommend that the National Park Service take a No-Action Alternative to the proposed new Draft General Management Plan and prevent unnecessary restrictions and regulations on our public lands.

William Hohn  
1310 S Elm Street  
Mountain View, MO 65548-7234  
phone: 417-934-6201  
captwilliep@centurytel.net

---

**Correspondence ID:** 526    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,02,2014 11:30:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I refer Alternative A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 527    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,02,2014 13:17:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We are new homeowner living in Mountain View, Missouri. We moved here expecting to retire and be able to canoe/fish the Jacks Fork and Current rivers. The National Park Service has just released a Draft General Management Plan that will add many unwanted changes, restrictions, and added cost for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Their Plan is all about what they want to do for the visitors and no consideration for us local folks. Their Plan includes closing 20 river access points. For us older folks, we need more access points to reduce our travel distance on the river. We strongly recommend that the National Park Service take the No-Action Alternative for the Draft General Management Plan to prevent additional program cost and hardship on us older local folks.

Bill & Janet Hohn  
1310 S Elm Street  
Mountain View, MO 65548-7234  
phone: 417-934-6201  
captwilliep@centurytel.net

---

**Correspondence ID:** 528    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,02,2014 15:28:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have tried to read as much as i can find from the National Park Service, and from my local state info on the closing of the Jack's fork and the Current River. I would like to say that I am not opposed to changes for the betterment of our great resource. But I can't see how such a drastic change would be beneficial to all of us that use this land. I urge you to vote the no-action proposal at this time. I don't know if the people making the choices for our rivers are from around here. But your welcome to come ride in my boat and head out one weekend, and we will stop and ask everyone we meet on the river that day and see if they want such changes made to their river. Come out and see all the happy family enjoying a great river. I am sure it would change your mind to come out and enjoy this great river and land with us.

again thanks for your time. I urge you to vote no action proposal  
Chris Williams

---

**Correspondence ID:** 529    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,02,2014 17:54:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Well I have lived within 5 miles of Current River for 8 years and within 20 miles of it my other 29 years. I can see absolutely NO reason for any changes. Horses have been on these rivers for hundreds of years without issue. I have never seen any real problem with the trail riders, they pick up their trash and are always polite. They stay on designated trails the best I can tell and don't bother anything. As for boats, "motorized vessels", why make the changes you are proposing. The boats are not really a problem. We are on the river at least 2 days a week from April, sometimes earlier thru December. I cant count on one hand the issues we have ran across in all the times and all the years. There is the occasional drunk canoer or tuber that acts the fool but it is what it is and has been very rare. Most every boater I've been around stops or slows for non-motorized vessels anytime its possible, with the exception of shoals where they just cannot. We have assisted floaters who have tipped, flipped, or sunk more times than I can possibly count. Countless times we have picked up trash from floaters who have tipped over, we never ever allow trash to float by or be left behind. I just DO NOT see where we pose any real problem at all. And if we do pose such a problem, why did we only see Park Rangers twice in all of 2013. Seriously! And why even suggest closing any parts of the river to boat traffic thru the fall and winter. There are virtually no floaters during mid October thru mid March. In the winter, it is mainly gigging traffic.

I firmly believe this is just another attempt by the Federal government to control everything. Well these lands were entrusted to you on the grounds that the public would have the use of them. Now you just keep taking more from us without good cause.

I COMPLETELY disagree with you holding meetings concerning local rivers in Kirkwood! Do you hold meetings here about proposed changes to the Arch or any other Federal parks, etc. NO YOU DO NOT! So exactly why would you let them affect the decision? Because some of them travel here a couple times a year and float. Wow! Well, meanwhile those of us around here utilize this river weekly, even daily! I travel to the Arch and other Federal parks once or twice a year, I fully expect you to hold meetings here regarding all park changes.

Do those of us actually affected the changes a favor and leave us alone!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 530 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,02,2014 20:35:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe that Option A is the best of the options but could live with B. Anything else is a loss for Missouri.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 531 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,02,2014 21:26:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do what you can to preserve the essence of Current River.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 532 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,02,2014 21:30:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I simply wish to preserve our rivers and streams

---

**Correspondence ID:** 533 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,03,2014 06:02:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It is my desire for you continue with the proven management program or implement plan C. It has been a tradition to keep access to Ozark National Waterways available to everyone and I feel that if A or B is implemented it will restrict those suffering from physical disabilities from full access to this treasure. Use NOT abuse!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 534 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,03,2014 07:28:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I like Alternate A the best. Alternate B could be acceptable. Alternate C is not acceptable.

The area is so beautiful and peaceful (part of the time). Let's restore its natural look and feel for next generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 535    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,03,2014 11:53:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I, WE DO NOT NEED THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO TELL US HOW TO MANAGE OUR RIVER WAYS THEY WILL MAKE A MESS OF THINGS AS THEY HAVE ALWAYS DONE,READ MY LETTER[WE DO NOT WANT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT INTERFERING WITH OUR PUBLIC LANDS]IT IS A WAY OF LIFE FOR US AND WE KNOW THERE IS AN ALTERNATIVE MOTIVE,WERE NOT DUMB HICKS WE KNOW WHAT IS RIGHT AND WRONG,AND WHAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WANTS TO DO IS WRONG. SINCERELY EDWARD A. FORD JR.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 536    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,03,2014 16:38:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** ONSR Draft General Management Plan

I am writing as a concerned Missouri resident regarding the effects ONSR Draft General Management Plan will have on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. Shutting down 20 access points to these rivers will have devastating effects on us local folks. Everything in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan is about the treatment of the visitor and there is no concern for us local folks. This is our back yard, we don't need guided float trips, guided fishing trips or guided field trips when it comes as an added cost to us in additional restrictions and regulations. For decades, the people of Missouri have successfully maintained and preserved the health of the rivers and surrounding areas. Local folks are more than capable of ensuring the health of the rivers, while permitting the public to use and enjoy the land they pay to preserve. I strongly recommend that the National Park Service take the No-Action Alternative On the ONSR Draft General Management Plan, to prevent unnecessary restrictions and regulations to our public lands.

William Hohn

---

**Correspondence ID:** 537    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,03,2014 17:30:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing as a concerned Missouri resident regarding the effects the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan will have on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and surrounding area. I remember when our three State Parks, Round Spring, Alley Spring and Big Spring were very well maintained by the Missouri Conservation. Today, you can see the lack of maintenance, added restrictions and regulations placed on us local people since the National Park Service has taken over the responsibility for our parks and rivers in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways . I strongly recommend that the National Park Service take the No-Action Alternative on the Draft General Management Plan, since they can't take care of what they have. Take a look at Falling Spring Mill, Turner's Mill Spring and Greer Spring, all are in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, they can't even maintain the arrows directing visitors down the paths to the scenic attraction. The path down to Greer Spring is loaded with Poison Ivy and Poison Oak. It's a real mess and a real waste of our money. The Missouri Conservation did a much better job then the National Park Service.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 538    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,03,2014 17:54:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing as a concerned Missouri resident regarding the effects the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan will have on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and surrounding area. I remember when our three State Parks, Round Spring, Alley Spring and Big Spring were very well maintained by the Missouri Conservation. Today, you can see the lack of maintenance, added restrictions and regulations placed on us local people since the National Park Service has taken over the responsibility for our parks and rivers in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways . I strongly recommend that the National Park Service take the No-Action Alternative on the Draft General Management Plan, since they can't take care of what they have. Take a look at Falling Spring Mill, Turner's Mill Spring and Greer Spring, all are in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, they can't even maintain the

arrows directing visitors down the paths to the scenic attraction. The path down to Greer Spring is loaded with Poison Ivy and Poison Oak. It's a real mess and a real waste of our money. The Missouri Conservation did a much better job then the National Park Service.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 539    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,03,2014 21:24:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing as a Missouri resident regarding the effects the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan will have on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I thought we killed the Ozarks Blueways Federal land grab and regulatory nightmare last year... Smells like shades of Agenda 21... Sounds like one more waste of our government money. I strongly recommend that the National Park Service take the No-Action Alternative to the Draft General Management Plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 540    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,04,2014 08:34:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am no longer a resident of Missouri's 8th District, but I grew up in Salem, where I still frequently visit family & friends. I also frequent the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers, most recently hiking with family to Cave Springs on Thanksgiving Day. A large part of my childhood was spent in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Park. I've taken my very first and my most recent float trip on the Current. While hunting with my father many years ago, I shot my first quail in the fields of Flying W after "blue stemming" across on a cold November day. I have a great love and pride for this place.

I'm stating my support for the draft GMP Alternative A. These rivers are changing and the users of the river have greatly increased within my 30 year experience on the rivers. Greater protection now is essential to keeping this area the pristine wilderness that it is today. The economic potential of surrounding towns depend on keeping the quality of these rivers high. Unfortunately, many local residents do not understand that.

I strongly disagree with Missouri 8th District House Representative Jason Smith who is encouraging local people to reject all three Alternatives and call for the "No Change Option". He does not speak for all of the locals - regardless of his claims. Many users of the ONSR are displeased with the NPS' management over the past 30 years, but to allow a "No Change" conclusion will simply lead us further down this unacceptable course, and the ONSR will suffer.

I believe that this update to the GMP is our opportunity and responsibility as people with local interests to insist that the NPS use the GMP update to provide management that broadens the types of visitors we hope to attract to our area. There are many local users of the ONSR who do not approve of the party atmosphere that has evolved on the Current River under the existing 1984 NPS GMP. These types of visitors show little respect for the natural environment of the ONSR or the quality of experience for anyone else on the rivers. The party crowd descends each summer weekend, often scaring off families, fishermen, and others who use the river to connect to the outdoors. They do spend money in the area through canoe and campsite rentals and purchasing alcohol, although most of the alcohol is purchased where they depart, before they ever arrive in the counties bordering the ONSR. This group of users is a minority, and their contribution to our economy is a small sliver of a larger, more diverse economic potential.

In response to the concerns of restricted access due to road and trail closures, it's clear that the largest ecological issue that is being addressed by these closures is that of sediment and gravel erosion into the streams. Locals have been aware of the gravel erosion problem for some time, and we would be more willing to accept measures to reduce it if the NPS themselves weren't notorious for circumventing that effort. Locals have a long memory, and events like the spreading of white chat gravel on tourist parking lots that lie well below the flood plain are more than enough cause to question the intentions and wisdom of NPS efforts at gravel erosion prevention. These kinds of bone-headed decisions must stop - and those responsible for making them must be removed from their responsibilities. Events such as that send a message to local people that the NPS is more concerned with paving the way for the commercial canoe industry than caring for the rivers or the opinions of local residents who care deeply for these streams.

Regardless of past erosion prevention failures, I do agree that there are more access points than necessary along the river, and that a great number of these are unmanaged by the NPS and in varying degrees of disrepair. I also understand and agree with the fact that in heavy rain, these roads and traces erode, dumping silt and gravel into streambeds already brimming with gravel. In general, I am in favor of a more detailed study that determines the access points that are the greatest offenders in contributing to the erosion problem, and the subsequent closing and restoration of these areas.

I have studied the Alternatives thoroughly and believe that Alternative A will be the most impactful and long lasting. I would like to express an emphasis on the importance of the NPS recruiting and working with local hiking trail and mountain biking trail enthusiasts. A healthy trail system throughout the ONSR and the Big Spring Wilderness should be a high priority. I would also like to emphasize the importance of enforcement of these new and existing regulations. It is a major failure of the current ONSR NPS that many existing regulations are not enforced leading to unauthorized horse trails and river access points. We would not be having many of the issues we are now if existing rules were enforced.

Lastly, I encourage the NPS to keep the existing schedule for the end of public comments and the establishment of the updated GMP. There is no legitimate reason for a 90 day delay. We the interested and engaged public have had plenty of time to study the published document.

Thank you

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	541	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,04,2014 08:42:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I favor Plan A. I am attracted to the Current River and Jack's Rivers for their wilderness like qualities. I plan my trips so that I can enjoy the rivers when they are not experiencing heavy numbers of recreational boaters utilizing outfitter services. I favor keeping development to an absolute minimum. Keep motorized boat use to a minimum. Do not allow any motors of 40/60 HP above Two Rivers. Get rid of the illegal riverside camps and illegal trail and road usage.				

By the way, I am encouraged with the ecological restoration work including prescribed burns that I have seen along ONSR. Good work!

Thank you for your service!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	542	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,04,2014 09:15:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern:				

I am contacting you to voice support for adopting an updated National Park Service General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I represent no organizations, only myself and several other local folks and visitors from around the area who frequent the ONSR. This letter does not specify a chosen Alternative but rather is intended as general support for a GMP update that allows the NPS to better patrol and preserve the scenic nature of the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers. Many of us will be submitting additional comments and specific suggestions independently.

Missouri 8th District House Representative Jason Smith is encouraging local people to reject all three Alternatives and call for the "No Change Option", charging the NPS with already over-managing and over-burdening local users while still failing at protecting the river environment. While we agree, in general, with his critique of the NPS' poor management legacy, we strongly disagree with his suggestion to reject a GMP update. Many users of the ONSR are

displeased with the NPS' management over the past 30 years, but to allow a "No Change" conclusion will simply lead us further down this unacceptable course, and the ONSR will suffer.

The tourism dollars spent by visitors to the ONSR is the economic lifeblood of towns like Salem. If the river ever becomes an undesirable vacation destination, it will dramatically impact the economy of our area. Some residents may associate any kind of new rules or restrictions in the ONSR as a threat to tourism. We disagree, and believe that this update to the GMP is our opportunity and responsibility as people with local interests to insist that the NPS use the GMP update to provide management that broadens the types of visitors we hope to attract to our area. There are many local users of the ONSR who do not approve of the party atmosphere that has evolved on the Current River under the existing 1984 NPS GMP. These types of visitors show little respect for the natural environment of the ONSR or the quality of experience for anyone else on the rivers. The party crowd descends each summer weekend, often scaring off families, fishermen, and others who use the river to connect to the outdoors. They do spend money in the area through canoe and campsite rentals and purchasing alcohol, although most of the alcohol is purchased where they depart, before they ever arrive in the counties bordering the ONSR. This group of users is a minority, and their contribution to our economy is a small sliver of a larger, more diverse economic potential.

We believe that the various zoning distinctions being proposed are sorely needed to offer guidance for the intended uses of the ONSR and to offer increased protection that requires more rigorous planning for future development of the ONSR. We also support the designation of the proposed area near Big Spring as "wilderness" due to the area existing currently as undeveloped land - wilderness in all aspects outside of official designation. The Ozarks, and Missouri in general, have very few options in providing a wilderness experience. Those who seek true undeveloped wilderness in a dramatic landscape are forced to head west to the Rocky Mountains or East to Appalachia. The Big Spring Wilderness can be an attractive alternative to local people and offer a destination to outdoor lovers coming from outside of the Missouri Ozarks.

In response to the concerns of restricted access due to road and trail closures, it's clear that the largest ecological issue that is being addressed by these closures is that of sediment and gravel erosion into the streams. Locals have been aware of the gravel erosion problem for some time, and we would be more willing to accept measures to reduce it if the NPS themselves weren't notorious for circumventing that effort. Locals have a long memory, and events like the spreading of chat gravel on tourist parking lots that lie well below the flood plain are more than enough cause to question the intentions and wisdom of NPS efforts at gravel erosion prevention. Regardless of past erosion prevention failures, we do agree that there are more access points than necessary along the river, and that a great number of these are unmanaged by the NPS and in varying degrees of disrepair. We also understand and agree with the fact that in heavy rain, these roads and traces erode, dumping silt and gravel into streambeds already brimming with gravel. In general, we are in favor of a more detailed study that determines the access points that are the greatest offenders in contributing to the erosion problem, and the subsequent closing and restoration of these areas. When promoting the idea of road closures, it's important for the NPS to understand that this knowledge of the back roads is a point of pride for those who have grown up here. It is also a very valuable method of finding ways to bypass the swarms of outsider tourists that are becoming more and more prevalent in the ONSR. The study of closing these access points should be undertaken with transparency and with open feedback from the local population. A compromise that could be considered by the NPS would be to determine and retain several of the least damaging and most valued secondary roads that are frequented by locals. These should be preserved as truly secondary access points, patrolled and to a degree maintained by the NPS, but not publicized or ever opened up for commercial use.

We support the proposal of a much greater trail network throughout the ONSR. Distinct trails could be established for hiking, horse riding, and mountain biking. We encourage the NPS to reach out to and work in collaboration with other trail establishment advocates around the area. We understand and agree that trails in erosion prone areas and river crossings are a water quality concern, and we agree with the intent to limit the number of these trails and river crossings. However, the long linear nature of the ONSR could provide opportunity for a great mileage of trails that traverse the ridgelines bordering the ONSR. If these trails were well-planned and well-built this would add a great community value to the ONSR with minimal impact upon the environment.

To conclude, we support thoughtful updates to the GMP that will encourage the NPS to change course and broaden the activities available in the ONSR while still insuring that the river retains a healthy water quality for users and adequate protection for the incredibly diverse animal species that reside there. With increased enforcement of new

protection efforts for the rivers, we can rein in the party crowd and attract other user groups. We have the opportunity to help the ONSR become an outdoor destination akin to the other great national parks, attracting visitors from across the nation and world to come and spend their money in our towns and at our pride and joy, Missouri's own national park. With an increase in wilderness areas and the establishment of specified horse, mountain bike, and hiking trails, we will not only attract canoeists and kayakers, but also hikers, cyclists, horse riders, hunters, anglers, backpackers, naturalists, and recreationalists. We can all coexist. Families will again feel comfortable and welcome in the ONSR. They will rent canoes on summer weekends, take winter hikes to visit notable springs and tributaries, experience views of the river from high country trails on horseback. They will rent hotels and bed-and-breakfasts in Salem, Van Buren, or Eminence, and maybe they will even tour a future Montauk museum that presents the history of settlement in the Ozark Riverways and reveals the artifacts and mystery left behind by those who walked these valleys thousands of years ago. Most importantly they will understand the importance of these rivers and why we fiercely defend them.

We encourage the NPS to adopt an update to the GMP that places utmost importance on preserving and protecting the natural environment of the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers.

Respectfully,

John Whitaker - Raleigh, NC (formerly of Salem, MO)

Matt Whitaker - Springfield, MO (formerly of Salem, MO)

David Beach - Springfield, MO - dbeach01@drury.edu  
Lloyd Blackwell - Salem, MO - lloydeblackwell@gmail.com  
Jonathan Bertz - jwbertz@gmail.com  
Patrice Bullard - Crowley, TX - patricebullard@sbcglobal.net  
Alicia Darnell - Dayton, OH (formerly of Rogersville, MO) - darnell.alicia@gmail.com  
Julie Davis - Tulsa, OK (formerly of Cassville, MO)  
Jen Dyson - Lincoln, NE - jensimsoc13@yahoo.com  
Jennifer Fenwick - New York, NY (formerly of Salem, MO) - jenjfen@gmail.com  
Brian Feldmann - St. Louis, MO  
Melody Fortner - Salem, MO - melfortner125@gmail.com  
Kyle Hampton - Springfield, MO (formerly of Salem, MO)  
Alicia Hampton - Springfield, MO (formerly of Salem, MO)  
Justin Happel - Springfield, MO (formerly of Salem, MO)  
Josh Harrold - Kansas City, MO - jharrold@harroldarchitects.com  
Emily Harrold - Kansas City, MO  
Bonnie Heithold - Columbia, MO (formerly of Salem, MO)  
Jake Heithold - Columbia, MO (formerly of Salem, MO) - jakeheithold@gmail.com  
Matt Johns - Dallas, TX  
Matthew Kempf - Kansas City, MO - matthew.kempf@gmail.com  
Tim Kinerk - Union, MO (formerly of Salem, MO) - tkinerk@gmail.com  
Kristine Knutter  
Kristy Kotschedoff - Springfield, MO (formerly of Salem, MO)  
Nick Lammers - Kansas City, MO - nicklammers2@gmail.com  
Nate Luke - Springfield, MO - nate@nateluke.com  
Keri McPherson - Coos Bay, OR (formerly of Lake of the Ozarks, MO)  
Will McPherson - Coos Bay, OR (formerly of Conway, AR) - wmcpherson20@gmail.com  
Lyle Mitchell - Salt Lake City, UT (formerly of Salem, MO) - alylemitchell@hotmail.com  
Chad Nichols - Fort Collins, CO (formerly of Salem, MO)  
Bryon Oster - Springfield, MO - bryonoster@gmail.com  
Raffaele Preston - Rolla, MO - Prafeston@gmail.com  
Conrad Prugh - Oklahoma City, OK (formerly of Salem, MO) - Prughc@deercreek.k12.ok.us  
Kevin Prugh - Jadwin, MO

Lauren Prugh - Oklahoma City, OK  
Nathan Prugh - Oklahoma City, OK (formerly of Salem, MO) - nathan.prugh@alumni.oc.edu  
Dan Richards - Rogers, AR - danielsrichards@gmail.com  
Noah Rienks - Rolla, MO  
Chad Risner - Kansas City, MO  
Erin Risner - Kansas City, MO (formerly of Springfield, MO) - erinswans@gmail.com  
Elizabeth Shain - Seattle, WA - eshainmtbc@gmail.com  
Nathan Shain - Seattle, WA - nathan.shain@hotmail.com  
Sesha Shannon Smith - Dallas, TX (formerly of Springfield, MO) - sesha@conveystudios.com  
Amanda Taylor Snelson - Riverside, CA (formerly of Springfield, MO) - asnelson03@gmail.com  
Avery Snelson - Riverside, CA (formerly of Springfield, MO) - averysnelson@gmail.com  
Traci Sooter - Springfield, MO  
Laura Stemick - Spangdahlem, Germany (formerly of Salem, MO) - laurastemick@gmail.com  
Chad Stemick - Spangdahlem, Germany (formerly of Salem, MO) - chad.stemick@gmail.com  
Dustin Tompkins - Broken Arrow, OK (formerly of Bentonville, AR) - drtompkin@gmail.com  
Seritha Twist - Siloam Springs, AR  
Malari Vandervort - Springfield, MO - malarivandervort@gmail.com  
Kay Whitaker - Salem, MO - kaywhit@centurylink.net  
Rachel Whitaker - Raleigh, NC rachelawhitaker@gmail.com

---

**Correspondence ID:** 543    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 10:55:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The plan and analysis is very thorough.

I find the land use portions of Alternative B too restrictive because access is the key to a good recreational experience. More roads and trails are needed, not fewer. I recommend land use and access provisions much closer to Alternative C than Alternative B. Only those few unofficial trails that are causing significant environmental problems should be closed. The remainder should be remain and some developed and maintained further.

I fully support the motorized boating and horsepower restrictions of Alternative B. The noise of power boats is disruptive to the majority of river users and should be accommodated on a limited basis but restricted per Alternative B.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 544    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 11:17:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sirs and Madams,

I am a resident of Ozark and Howell counties for the last 23 years, but have been floating the Current and Jacks Fork rivers for the past 30 years. I live near the North Fork of the White river and consider myself a steward of land that washes itself into the river.

These rivers provide so many with the opportunity to commune with nature. Over the last many years I have seen changes in the rivers that are not good. Many new trails have appeared, the sound of motorized boats disturbs the peace of the day, and 4 wheelers and other 4-wheeled vehicles come to "play" in the sandy banks (drivers often well lubricated with alcohol). Every time that I go camping I spend an hour in the morning picking up trash from the river bank. We filled 4 kayaks with large trash bags full last summer on the Jacks Fork.

We are fortunate to have these natural areas that are vital to our spiritual and mental health. There is a growing body of evidence that suggests that separation from the wilderness has profound untoward psychological and physical effects upon humans. Confinement in Urban setting has been linked to attention problems, mood disorders and addictions.

I think that if you count the number of motorized vehicles that utilize these rivers you will find that only a few motor boats are present relative to canoes and kayaks, but that one motor disturbs the peace of many. I have had the



experience of trying to avoid being knocked over by motorboats on the last stretch of the Jacks Fork near 2 Rivers. It did not appear to me that these gentlemen were fishing, and their attitudes were not courteous. It is my strong opinion that motorized boats have NO place on these pristine rivers. The argument for fishing is easily resolved: canoes work just fine for that.

I cannot state strongly enough how wrong it is that thousands of horses are ridden along the river bank, into the stream and all along the watershed. I have for many years heard stories of the drunken revelry, taken care of drunks in various stages of alcohol poisoning, and witnessed the rude behavior of these people. I have seen people washing their horses with soap in the river. The coliform burden from all of these animals is enormous. I have horses and have ridden beautiful Ozark trails throughout my life here, but I would not consider riding in the river or washing my horse in it.

I am strongly in favor of Option A. I would very much like to be there to publicly comment but have to be at work that evening. Please cast my vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Clara N. Applegate, M.D.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 545 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 14:36:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the wilderness designation and the wild and scenic river designation for the entire area. ban all hunting and trapping and wildlife and bird assault and attack by gun wacko predators from this site. no law requires that every public site be made into a wildlife attack area for gun wacko human predators. the fact is wildlife watchers are the majority of the American population and spend much more money than the gun wackos, so when you let in these insane people with their guns you scare away the families who are the American majority. its time to stop turning every public site into a dick cheney assault area. led shot decays and polluts air and water, so that these gun wackos bring in pollution with them. and that is violating the wetlands protection act and the endangered species act because those gun wackos kill everything they see. their poaching numbers and wounding numbers are notorious. leave the place natural and stop letting govt employees boost their salaries by touching everything to make extra pay. this plan impairs the park for future generations. you need to understand that the usfws under the direction of dan ashe, gun wacko hunter/wildlife murderer, wants to turn every American site into gun wacko heaven and the number of hunters is diminishing every single year. people do not hunt anymore. hunters represent just 2% of the American population. you are acting as if this is still 1940. it is not this is a plan of destruction, killing and slaughter. the American public does not need fake grassland. storms come along and create them naturally with weak trees and that is the way it is better functionally. ban all prescribed burning, motorized vehicles which are noisy and eroding. this comment is for the public record. our govt agencies have become totally corrupt and seem to be all taking bribes from the nra.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 546 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 18:47:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Of the options available, B would be my preference. The best option is to make the area a true backcountry destination with limited access by permit only.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 547 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 19:38:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing as a concerned citizen of the state of Missouri regarding the effects of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Draft General Management Plan.

The lifeblood (livelihood, culture, recreation) of the people (Ozark Mountain people) of Round Springs, Missouri was centered around Current River and the surrounding mountains, valley's and creeks. The people of the community were trappers, hunters, fisherman, loggers, farmers, saw millers, merchants, postmasters, teachers, engineers and moonshiners. The economy of Round Springs depended upon the natural resources of the surrounding

area. Round Springs had two general stores, ( Carr's and Vaughn's Spring Valley Store) a post office, a state park, three canoe rentals(Carr's, Sullivan's, and Vaughn's) two lodging establishments,(Round Springs Lodge and Cottages, Bank's Cabins), two restaurants(Patterson's and Hinkle's) Round Spring's Cave, Spenser's Sawmill and Camp Zoe's Children's Camp.

The economy of Round Springs was adversely impacted by the Ozark National Scenic Riverways as the result of limiting access to the river and acquisition and then closure of most of the above mentioned businesses and of many existing roads and limiting access to the river. The only remaining business is Carr's Canoe Rental. The remaining access to the river are: Carr's Landing, Round Springs Middle Landing and Round Spring Lower landing (Asphalt). The following river accesses have been closed:

1. Road and access to Mose Prater Place
2. Vehicle access at mouth of Sinkin Creek
3. Access above Sinkin Creek Bridge
4. Road and access to Philchew and Willhite Hollow
5. Road and access to Tom Conway Place(Barton Hollow)
6. Access from Rt. 19 across river from Benton Hollow.
7. Access to Sawdust hole
8. Road and access to Courthouse Subdivision

Plainly speaking, most everything that made Round Springs a good community to live and visit is no longer available to the general public. Riverfront and Spring Branch camping have been virtually eliminated. Roads to favorite camping, fishing and hunting spots have been closed. Many older and handicapped people can no longer camp, fish or hunt due to limited vehicle access to the spring branch, river and surrounding area.

I strongly recommend that the National Park Service take the No-Action Alternative to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Draft General Management Plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 548    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 19:41:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing as a concerned citizen of the state of Missouri regarding the effects of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Draft General Management Plan.

Law enforcement in Ozark National Scenic Riverways is a dismal failure. The geography of the park (90 miles long, ½ mile wide) laced with county roads makes law enforcement extremely difficult. Let the general public keep the existing roads and trails for recreation and emergency use. Before the establishment of the ONSR the individual landowners enforced strict rules according to their way of thinking. People did not abuse the river and surrounding land; bad plan; the people became unwelcome. Now that the river and land is controlled by the National Park Service, lack of respect for the river, land and people is rampant. A few people are destroying the whole park. The attitude is that if something belongs to the government then people feel that they are entitled to do as they please. This attitude creates many problems for both the local people and tourist. Law enforcement needs to be highly visible, enforce existing regulations and educate the public. Management needs to develop regulations and have a management plan that provides for a positive experience for all the people.

I strongly recommend that the National Park Service take the No-Action Alternative to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Draft General Management Plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 549    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 19:51:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing as a concerned citizen of the state of Missouri regarding the effects of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Draft General Management Plan.

The Draft General Management Plan developed by the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is written to satisfy well-

funded special interest groups. The general population is unaware of the management plan and what they want does not seem to matter. I feel the general population wants the park managed in such a way that all people can access, use and enjoy the park while still maintaining and preserving it. The Draft General Management Plan fails to address the social aspects of the people, (both the tourist and local communities). The plan fails to address the needs of the old and handicapped, the local businesses, the tourist. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Draft General Management Plan promotes the Park for the Park's benefit and has become a bureaucracy that provides for and consumes itself from within. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways needs to be managed and run for the use and enjoyment of all the people, not a select few.

I strongly recommend that the National Park Service take the No-Action Alternative to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Draft General Management Plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 550    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 19:54:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing as a concerned citizen of the state of Missouri regarding the effects of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Draft General Management Plan.

I grew up in the Round Spring's Community, working as a teenager for the Round Springs Lodge, Cottages, and Caverns; Camp Zoe Children's Camp, Round Springs State Park and Seasonal Park Ranger for the National Park Service. Round Springs is a microcosm of many communities throughout Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Many communities have all suffered and died with the help of the National Park Service. Favorite camping, fishing, and hunting spots are no longer accessible. Let's give the park back to the people, return it to the Missouri State Park System and manage it for the people, not special interest groups.

I strongly recommend that the National Park Service take the No-Action Alternative to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Draft General Management Plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 551    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 20:06:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have family in the Eminence area and visit there usually twice a year. I love the area and think it is beautiful. We do some camping along with swimming and canoeing. But what we enjoy doing the most is bringing our Polaris ranger and riding around and looking at all the beautiful scenery. I'm not sayin that we would quit coming but we might not come as much and would take something away that we enjoy doing very much in the area. I hope the area stays open to horseback riding and atv riding on the proper roads.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 552    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 20:28:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** These natural resources have to be protected by legislation. If you let people (and horses and cattle and swine) go roughshod over these NPS controlled waterways, it'll just be a continued downward spiral. Please, please, error on the side of caution and go for protection.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 553    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,05,2014 01:21:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We use the the riverways in Missouri quite often for treatment outings for our youth. With that being said, I believe that plan B would work best for us with the permission of gravel bar camping. We do practice Leave No Trace in our program so we always leave our sites cleaner than we found them. Generally it is difficult to camp in campgrounds with our troubled youth.

Thank You  
Bradley Buck Harris

---

**Correspondence ID:** 554    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,05,2014 09:51:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to complement the NPS on trying to address the many issues of concern at the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Having worked in the Missouri State Park System for 32 years, the last 3 as the director of the Planning & Development program, I know how difficult it is to resolve issues that are of such local concern while at the same time trying to protect the resources that make the area significant as a national park. I do however think it is time to deal with these issues because the situation with unauthorized river access and non-designate trail use is never going to get any easier. The ONSR needs to be afforded the same protection as any other unit of the the national park system and I don't believe the abuses that are taking place on the riverways would be tolerated in Yellowstone, Yosemite, the Grand Canyon or almost any other national park. If the resource is lost due to abuse or over use all the benefits it provides both economically and recreationally will be lost to both the local community as well as everyone else. So despite the locals desire to use the ONSR as they like, they can't have their cake and eat it too. I understand that compromise is required to make any plan work therefore I would like to lend my support to Alternative B which I feel would address most of my concerns. I would however like to see the standards for horsepower limits that are proposed in alternative A extended to alternative B. Implementation of alternative B will probably require additional staff which I would support. Thank you for the opportunity comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 555 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,05,2014 10:12:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been a user of the Current and Jacks Fork rivers for many years and have floated it numerous times. I have been disappointed in the increased amount of vehicular access that has been allowed to develop to most gravel bars. I would like to see the NPS reduce significantly the amount of vehicular access and streamside vehicular camping now found along the rivers.

I am in favor of Alternative B of the proposed plan with the exception that I would like the same motorpower limits proposed in alternative A for the Pulltight to Two Rivers stretch of river included in Alternative B.

I greatly support the idea of an NPS campground at Akers Ferry; like there was a number of years ago.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 556 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,05,2014 10:23:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I wish to comment on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways National Park's General Management Plan. While there are a great number of issues, I wish to comment only on the horseback riding issue. I do support protection and strong but fair management of the river and the surrounding lands around the river. In regard to the alternatives, I favor a mixture of alternative B and C for the horse trails. I support the closing of the multiple river crossings as long as there are adequate crossing for riders to cross for access to trails along the river. I am not opposed to some kind of bridle tag or permit for horseback riding only if all trail users, not just horseback riders, have similar permits for trail use. The permits need to be reasonable in cost, and the revenue goes to the management of horse trails, horse trailheads, staging areas, and campgrounds and not into the general coffers. I support alternative C for maximum equestrian trail miles only because too few trails will create overuse and further environment damage. I wish to see the most popular social trails that currently exist be the ones selected for designation. The trails along the river that were once old roads such as the one around the Flying W, the old roads leading to Ackers Ferry, the Susie Nichols cabin should be selected for designation. All users want to be near the water, has a destination, and these old roads do no damage to the environment at this point.

I support environmentally sound horseback staging areas and a campground with as easy access as possible for large trailers and enough campsites for a good number. Once the Horse Management Plan is started it is vital to have horse people involved in the planning to form a sense of responsibility and stewardship.

I realize the Park is constantly facing funding and manpower shortages to implement many of the changes that are needed for the Park. I would encourage strong educational programs or events for horseback riders; involve Show-Me Missouri Back Country Horsemen in your planning and taking advantage of their mission to protect access through volunteer efforts and help; and being very inclusive to area riders. The creation of a Horse Patrol similar to the current one but in the Upper Current River area may be helpful if involving the local riders.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 557    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,05,2014 11:22:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Plan C #1 Over 50 years ago I went with my Father to meetings put on by the county, state and federal farm agent's on ways to control erosion along creeks and rivers because of the increase in the numbers of livestock. The answer

was "make the livestock walk more and different paths and cross in more and different places". With the very big increase in numbers of livestock in the last 50 plus years this years advice was the same. The numbers of livestock per acre on public land and mile of river is very small compared to the farm. If more paths [trails] and more river crossing has worked for farmers for 50 plus years why will it not work for public land?

# 2 Water Pollution; Look at the number of people floating the river per day, month and year. Look at the number of port-a-pots that are require for this number of people at fairs, concert, and horse shows. Check out the horse trails near the river "people use them for restrooms". The water pollution is human not equine. Suggestion: Because the float trip operator needs a clean river they should be require to place a port-a-pot very hour of a float on the river and maintain them. The float trip operator takes no responsible for the human waste along the river. Also the addition of more horse trails near and crossing the river would spread out the human waste.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 558    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,05,2014 14:50:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing as a concerned Missouri resident regarding the effects the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan will have on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and surrounding area. I thought we killed the Ozarks Blueways Federal land grab and regulatory nightmare last year... Smells like shades of Agenda 21... Sounds like another waste of our government money. I strongly recommend that the National Park Service take the No-Action Alternative to prevent the unnecessary cost, restrictions and regulations to our public lands.

William Hohn  
1310 S Elm Street  
Mountain View, MO 65548-7234  
phone: 417-934-6201  
captwilliep@centurytel.net

---

**Correspondence ID:** 559    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,05,2014 16:27:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I need your help... Will you forward the attached letter to the Superintendent of the National Park Service, Mr. William H. Black, for me? I was told that his email address was: ozar\_superintendent@nps.gov When I use this address, I get the following message:

Hello captwilliep@centurytel.net,

We're writing to let you know that the group you tried to contact (ozar\_superintendent) may not exist, or you may not have permission to post messages to the group. A few more details on why you weren't able to post:

- \* You might have spelled or formatted the group name incorrectly.
- \* The owner of the group may have removed this group.
- \* You may need to join the group before receiving permission to post.

\* This group may not be open to posting.

Will you help me to forward the following message to Mr. Black.

I am writing as a concerned citizen of the state of Missouri regarding the effects of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Draft General Management Plan.

The lifeblood (livelihood, culture, recreation) of the people (Ozark Mountain people) of Round Springs, Missouri was centered around Current River and the surrounding mountains, valley's and creeks. The people of the community were trappers, hunters, fisherman, loggers, farmers, saw millers, merchants, postmasters, teachers, engineers and moonshiners. The economy of Round Springs depended upon the natural resources of the surrounding area. Round Springs had two general stores, ( Carr's and Vaughn's Spring Valley Store) a post office, a state park, three canoe rentals(Carr's, Sullivan's, and Vaughn's) two lodging establishments,(Round Springs Lodge and Cottages, Bank's Cabins), two restaurants(Patterson's and Hinkle's) Round Spring's Cave, Spenser's Sawmill and Camp Zoe's Children's Camp.

The economy of Round Springs was adversely impacted by the Ozark National Scenic Riverways as the result of limiting access to the river and acquisition and then closure of most of the above mentioned businesses and of many existing roads and limiting access to the river. The only remaining business is Carr's Canoe Rental. The remaining access to the river are: Carr's Landing, Round Springs Middle Landing and Round Spring Lower landing (Asphalt). The following river accesses have been closed:

1. Road and access to Mose Prater Place
2. Vehicle access at mouth of Sinkin Creek
3. Access above Sinkin Creek Bridge
4. Road and access to Philchew and Willhite Hollow
5. Road and access to Tom Conway Place(Barton Hollow)
6. Access from Rt. 19 across river from Benton Hollow.
7. Access to Sawdust hole
8. Road and access to Courthouse Subdivision

Plainly speaking, most everything that made Round Springs a good community to live and visit is no longer available to the general public. Riverfront and Spring Branch camping have been virtually eliminated. Roads to favorite camping, fishing and hunting spots have been closed. Many older and handicapped people can no longer camp, fish or hunt due to limited vehicle access to the spring branch, river and surrounding area.

Law enforcement in Ozark National Scenic Riverways is a dismal failure. The geography of the park (90 miles long, 1½ mile wide) laced with county roads makes law enforcement extremely difficult. Let the general public keep the existing roads and trails for recreation and emergency use. Before the establishment of the ONSR the individual landowners enforced strict rules according to their way of thinking. People did not abuse the river and surrounding land; bad plan; the people became unwelcome. Now that the river and land is controlled by the National Park Service, lack of respect for the river, land and people is rampant. A few people are destroying the whole park. The attitude is that if something belongs to the government then people feel that they are entitled to do as they please. This attitude creates many problems for both the local people and tourist. Law enforcement needs to be highly visible, enforce existing regulations and educate the public. Management needs to develop regulations and have a management plan that provides for a positive experience for all the people.

The Draft General Management Plan developed by the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is written to satisfy well-funded special interest groups. The general population is unaware of the management plan and what they want does not seem to matter. I feel the general population wants the park managed in such a way that all people can access, use and enjoy the park while still maintaining and preserving it. The Draft General Management Plan fails to address the social aspects of the people, (both the tourist and local communities). The plan fails to address the needs of the old and handicapped, the local businesses, the tourist. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Draft General Management Plan promotes the Park for the Park's benefit and has become a bureaucracy that provides for and consumes itself from within. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways needs to be managed and run for the use and

enjoyment of all the people, not a select few.

I grew up in the Round Spring's Community, working as a teenager for the Round Springs Lodge, Cottages, and Caverns; Camp Zoe Children's Camp, Round Springs State Park and Seasonal Park Ranger for the National Park Service. Round Springs is a microcosm of many communities throughout Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Many communities have all suffered and died with the help of the National Park Service. Favorite camping, fishing, and hunting spots are no longer accessible. Let's give the park back to the people, return it to the Missouri State Park System and manage it for the people, not special interest groups.

I strongly recommend that the National Park Service take the No-Action Alternative to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Draft General Management Plan.

William Hohn

---

**Correspondence ID:** 560 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,05,2014 17:02:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Although I do not reside there now I do own property there. I know that the NPS was to be a park service when it first started. It has now become a control freak like any government entity left unchecked. The Jacks Fork-Current River should be returned to the status that it was before the park service took control. Open up the roads and let people camp on the river as it was then. Leave the boaters and their boats alone. We do not need more controls.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 561 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,05,2014 18:37:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am hoping to attend the meeting at Powder Valley on Jan 8th but, due to the current weather, I am afraid it will be canceled.

So, I will comment here to make sure my views are heard.

I have floated and camped on the Jack's Fork and Current rivers my entire life. Most of this time has been spent camping at Alley Springs. I have floated the entire length of the Jack's Fork river from the prongs to two rivers. I enjoy the Ozark National Scenic Riverways very much. There is nothing better than an overnight float on these rivers. I hope that I can retire with land on one of these rivers.

Here are my comments relative to the management of the ONSR.

1. There should be no motors allowed on any boats upstream of the bridge in Eminence on the Jack's Fork. There is no reason, the river is not big enough for motor use and it just destroys the pristine environment.
2. The locals should be able to use old access roads to continue there lifestyle. I have befriended many of the local residents and find that the use of local roads is part of their everyday lifestyle. Tourists should be limited to designated roads.
3. No motorized vehicles should be allowed in any river in the ONSR.
4. There needs to be a better way to integrate the rangers with the tourists and the locals. Too often they are looked at as cops. I understand that there are federal laws that need to be enforced but this needs to be done in a way that brings people together to protect the beauty of the area. I say this not as a criticism but as a way to improve the mission of the National Park.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Doug Guenther

---

**Correspondence ID:** 562 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,05,2014 18:55:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** A review of the preferred plan appears to favor horse enthusiasts over other river users. While

undesigned trails will be closed, new trails and a campground for horses would be developed. At the same time, gravel bars and other access points will be closed to vehicles but no other vehicle access will be developed. Horses may be less appear to be less intrusive when casually compared to vehicles, but large trucks and trailers are brought into the area to haul the horses in, not to mention the manure left behind around and in the river.

Those of us who like to drive onto a gravel bar and pitch a tent next to the river will be driven out. The only camping available will now be in a designated slot next to other campers in their designated slots which are built so closely together we can hear each others conversations. Not exactly accoustically pleasing - one of the goals of the plan. But it will make it easier for the park rangers to keep an eye on everyone. I agree there are sometimes rowdy visitors, but not everyone should suffer due to the poor behavior of a few. Camping next to the river will be available only if you access it from the river. Really, isn't the best part of visiting the Riverways park is to be able to access it?

The gravel bars have been driven on for many years with no adverse effects on them. Why would we be banned from driving on them? It is the most simple way to access and enjoy the resources the park has to offer.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 563    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 07:36:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Leave the motor limit as it is. Just as they are now.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 564    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 07:39:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Do not close the roads to ricer access.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 565    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 07:43:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Leave the park as is the option I want.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 566    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 08:02:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I was born and raised in Poplar Bluff, Mo. I go back often to visit and always visit Current River! I spent many hours enjoying float trips, camping, day trips to Big Springs, and swimming in Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. I have friends who's family property in Winona and Eminence was taken to be part of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. As I understand the Ozark National Scenic Riverways was formed to protect the areas and provide management for the ecology. If more homes are being allowed built, more motorboats cruising the rivers, motor vehicles forging unauthorized roads then the ecology is disrupted. The program should maintain and manage these issues. If rules need to be made to prevent growth that hampers the environment then they should be made. Program A seems like the best plan to do this even though there will be those who grumble because their freedom to use the land gets limited, the land needs protecting. I love the peace and stillness when I visit, although I see the summers have become more and more crowded and there lies the problems of maintaing the land. I want to encourage you to implement a worthy plan, please don't let this all go to waste!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 567    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 08:42:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it concerns,  
I support Alternative A. I was born and raised in Shannon County, Missouri beginning in the early 1980's. I spent many summer days within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) boundaries, notably on the rivers. I have great respect for the rivers and their natural habitat as do most of the locals. Both of my parents dedicated their careers of public service with the National Park Service and have combined over 50 years of service to more than just ONSR, including Yellowstone National Park, Rocky Mountain National Park, LBJ National Historical Park,



and Buffalo National River. However, ONSR holds a special place in all of our hearts due to the memories we have growing up there and hope to continue to share the rivers with our future children and generations to come.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Deanna Dillard

---

**Correspondence ID:** 568 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 08:52:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please adopt Alternative A. I grew up in southern Missouri and canoed on both the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers. Limiting vehicle and horse traffic is important- -I recall seeing animal dung floating down the Wabash River once- -keeping horses out the river prevents this. Also, when vehicles are allowed near the river the great blue herons, deer and other wildlife are scared away.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 569 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 09:05:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to congratulate the NPS team on a detailed and interesting management plan. You have provided valuable information to judge the alternatives available. Having used the Scenic Riverways on both the Current and Jack's Fork rivers for over 45 years I fully recognize their outstanding wilderness qualities and the valuable resource they provide for users from around the world.

I am in favor of your Alternative A because I believe that the area is best appreciated for its solitude and natural beauty and it appears that this alternative would best enhance those features. I have floated all sections of both rivers down to Big Spring and believe Alternative A provides adequate access for motorized watercraft while preserving the best floating areas to non-motorized craft. Having camped on the gravel bars and hiked into backwoods primitive campsites I also think that access should be limited to those willing to put in the effort to reach them. I believe Alternative A's restriction of vehicular traffic to gravel bars is a positive feature of the plan. I also think that the creation of designated horse trails and closure of non-designated trails to horses reaches a good balance.

I favor any approach that increases primitive and designated wilderness areas. Alternative C is clearly unacceptable in that it would alter the essential wilderness qualities that make this area so wonderful. I do favor Alternative A but could live with the NPS preferred Alternative B.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 570 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 09:18:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Test

---

**Correspondence ID:** 571 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 11:01:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would prefer alternative A of the ones listed in your plan.

Regardless of which plan you adopt, it will be worthless if there is no enforcement of the policy. The park now is pretty much open to all abuses. There is not law enforcement now. I cannot believe all the open access roads and illegal horse trails along the rivers. I cannot find a gravel bar to camp on that does not have a road or a horse trail across it.

I drove up a road from the campground at Bay Creek on the Jacks Fork for miles one day. There were people living up there in campers that obviously had not been moved in months. Some had CORDS of firewood stacked next to them. It is pretty obvious that anything goes as far as vehicle access.

I did like all the plan alternatives when it comes to horses. I feel that there is no place for horses within 100 yards of the rivers. There is plenty of opportunity for horseback riding in areas all around the Ozark National Scenic

Riverways. Many, many miles of trail are open on private trails and national and state forest. We don't need horses defecating in the river or being washed in the river.

I plan to attend the meeting at Salem if it is ever held and I can make it. I think it is important that you know all the "locals" are not supportive of the open range mentality of the park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 572 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 11:40:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been floating and camping on the Jacks Fork with my children and extended family for the past thirty years. Now retired, I look forward to spending more days on the river. For the past ten years my brother and I meet at Eminence, put in at Buck Hollow and float, camp overnight, and finish the float the next day. No-trace camping on the gravel bars far away from cars and noise is a most pleasurable experience. I do feel that horse back riding pollution, jet boats, sewer runoff from Alley Springs, trashed out camp grounds, and loud noisy campers are a problem. How you manage it will be interesting. I love the Ozarks, moved here on purpose to be close to the beauty and wonder of it's unique ecosystems. To be restricted from access to the wilderness rivers, I am not supportive of. For the waterways to be regulated for use by the public in a ecofriendly way, I do support.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 573 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 13:00:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alternative A, because it provides the most robust protection for the Park's resources.

In particular, this alternative promises action the three top threats to the park, which include:

1. Excessive horse traffic, which results in water pollution as well as collision hazards.
2. ATVs in the rivers - by shutting down illegal roads, and clamping down on motorized camping on the gravel bars, Alternative A would reduce noise pollution, erosion, and collisions.
3. Wilderness Protection for the Big Spring area - it is important to manage this area as a wilderness, and both Alternative A and B provide expanded protection here.

My family and I canoe on the Current River every year, and we have a trip planned to the Jacks Fork for this May. I was also on the Current River this past October to do volunteer trail maintenance on a hiking trail that runs next to the ONSR.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 574 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 13:25:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My preference is for option A. What is good for nature is ultimately good for humans.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 575 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 14:10:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I wanted to write in to give my support for proposal "B," which is supported by the NPS and a variety of other organizations who favor protecting The gems that are these rivers. I understand why there may be local opposition, but time and time again, history has proven that preservation of the few remaining "islands" of wildness is not only an economic benefit to the region, but also to the soul of our nation. Folks hollered about Yellowstone, the Tetons, Yosimite, the list goes on. Nobody regrets saving them now!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 576 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 15:12:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing as a concerned Missouri resident regarding the effects the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan will have on my fishing the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. After reviewing the Draft General Management Plan, it is my understanding that the National Park Service recommends

closing many of the river access points as well as many of the roads near the rivers. I have lived and worked most all of my life in Missouri. I have supported my country by joining the U. S. Marine Corps and fighting in the Korean war. I have paid my taxes and have been a good citizen all of my life. All I want is a simple retirement and to be able to canoe and fish the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers without the fear of the Federal Government getting in my way. The Federal Government is already trying to screw up my Medicare, that I already paid for, and now you are trying to screw up my fishin. All I want is for the Federal Government to stop screwing with me and my fishin. I strongly recommend that the National Park Service take the No-Action Alternative to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan and prevent closing access points on our rivers, increased restrictions and increased regulations to our public lands.

William Hohn  
1310 S Elm Street  
Mountain View, MO 65548-7234  
phone: 417-934-6201  
captwilliep@centurytel.net

---

**Correspondence ID:** 577    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,06,2014 16:15:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I Am the 5th generation that has lived on or near Current River. My ancestors moved in from South Carolina in 1856. They lived on Current River from Sutton's Creek to Big Creek. You can imagine all the stories I've been told on how they lived on the river. i like to take my kids and grand-kids to the river as much as possible. We love to camp, boat ride fish and hunt on the river. But the way things are going it doesn't look like we are going to be able to enjoy the river the way my ancestors did. They fished, hunted, and camped on the river year round. I think you need to go with the no action proposal. Let us enjoy the river the way we have been for the last 5 generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 578    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,06,2014 16:39:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the strongest environmental protections possible for the Current and Jacks Forks Riverways. Therefore I support ALTERNATIVE A. Alternative A provides for the largest non-motorized river segments, it decommissions the most miles of illegal horse riding trails and provides the most protection for gravel bars. I am also in support of a Wilderness status option.

I have enjoyed many beautiful outings in the area of the Current and Jacks Forks Rivers. This is a unique and delicate ecosystem that requires the strongest environmental protection possible.

I support the National Parks Service management of this priceless area and thank you for this comprehensive plan option.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 579    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,06,2014 16:48:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing as a concerned Missouri resident regarding the effects the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan will have on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers.

Does the National Park Service really know what they are doing??? On the upper Jacks Fork River, at the Highway 17 river access point, there is a park sign stating the fishing regulations on the Smallmouth Bass and stating that the upper Jacks Fork River was becoming a world class fishing area for the Smallmouth Bass. This was great news.

Talking with some local residents there, they told me that the National Park Service just released 16 pairs of otters into the river and they have eaten all the fish in the upper Jacks Fork River. Please tell me what is going on??? Is this

an example of how the National Park Service operates??? I strongly recommend that the National Park Service leave our rivers alone and take the No-Action Alternative on the ONSR Draft General Management Plan to prevent unnecessary cost, restrictions and regulations to our public rivers and public lands. Bring back the Missouri Conservation to manage our rivers and public lands.

William Hohn

---

**Correspondence ID:** 580    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 17:37:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPS,

I grew up floating along the pristine rivers of south east Missouri in particular the Current and Jacks Fork rivers. My earliest and fondest memories are of building camp with my dad on these rivers. I caught my first fish on the Current and caught my first trout on the Jacks Fork. I learned how to jump off a rope swing and where the best crayfish holes are on these rivers. I've found there's nothing more enjoyable than sitting on a gravel bar in the hot summer sun then jumping in to the cool refreshing river water. I have traveled across the world and there are less than a handful of places that compare to the beauty found in Southeast MO. I look forward to the day I can raise my own children teaching them the virtues and wisdom of life that can only come by spending time in nature only found on the Current or Jacks can bring. We are the only ones who can preserve this precious gift from god for future generations.

Sincerely,

Z Lee Stokely

---

**Correspondence ID:** 581    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 17:58:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I've floated (canoe) on current river for at least 25 years. The proposed horsepower limits are a non-starter for me. On multiple occasions me or my family have been insulted, threatened, etc. by recreational canoe/tube floaters high on drugs and alcohol. I can't recall a single instance of such behavior by someone in a jon boat. How do these plans help the NPS ENFORCE the laws already established?

I would like to see an alcohol free river. It has no place on the river if people truly wish to have a genuine outdoor experience.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 582    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** First, I would like to thank the National Park Service for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo.

Nevertheless, it seems to me that Alternative B does not go far enough. I would recommend the adoption of Alternative A, since it provides additional protections for the rivers such as:  
â€Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;  
â€Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings;  
â€Bars vehicle access to gravel bars.

I remember my first float trip on the Jack's Fork/Current Rivers, and wholeheartedly recommend that they be protected from these kinds of degradations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 583    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 19:31:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I prefer Alternative A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 584    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 19:32:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have lived in Hartshorn most of my life. My fondest memories are of camping, floating, fishing and boating on the Current River. Akers Ferry is just 11 miles from my home of 38 years. I cannot remember a summer when I didn't spend time at Akers Ferry. In the evenings when I was growing up, my family would go down to Akers, 2 or 3 evenings a week, so we could enjoy our supper and a swim. Since I have my own family now, my own children have their own memories of Current River and Akers Ferry. We bought a boat with a 25 hour power motor when our children were young. We would put in at Akers Ferry and go up passed Welch Cave, Trout Fishing, or gigging. Our children learned to fish on this stretch of the river. Now my children have grown up and moved away and have their own families, but they always come home several times a year to go Trout Fishing and gigging. With this proposed plan, we are going to lose our stretch of the river that we have always enjoyed. My grandchildren will never get to experience the fun that my children had on this end of Current River. I believe that this stretch of Current River is quite big enough for the canoe traffic and the 25 HP boats. Most of us that own boats in this area, are hard working people that have lived in this area all of our lives. We are, for the most part, family oriented. Most of us were Baptized at Akers Ferry. My point is, I feel like the locals are being SHUT OFF of the river, so that the tourist will be the only ones allowed you utilize this upper end of Current River.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 585    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 19:55:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I moved to this area when Congress was considering including the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers in the National Park System. Springs and rivers have always fascinated me and the National Park System being considered, I felt, may perhaps provide me summer employment to complement my teaching of biology, chemistry, etc. throughout the school terms. Indeed, I worked as a Ranger, a Naturalist, and later purchased and ran Camp Zoe, and finally, I worked as the environmental coordinator at the Welch YCC facility. These experiences have allowed me to appreciate and enjoy the beauty of the area. At the same time, the increased visitation of outsiders as well as the local citizens' use of this area have caused much concern as I observed the relatively recent destruction of areas not seen by most of the rivers' floaters. This destruction has been caused by only a few and, with the exception of the horses, it is the result of four-wheeling trucks driven by people who enjoy the rush of mud on the seldom-traveled off-road timbering trails. The truck drivers now have "Flat Nasty" to quench their thirst for backwoods trails. The equestrian trail riders, I believe, might be catered to by developing numerous quality trail systems that do not negatively impact the countryside or the river quality, as I believe the current ones now do. The development of these trails may be quite costly; therefore, our present Congressman, the Honorable Jason Smith, should be able to secure federal funding for this project since his desire seems to be to allow anyone to use this formerly pristine area in any way they might desire. The quality of a river float trip on the Upper Current River must be preserved for visitors. They come because of the water quality, beautiful springs, and their desire to visit a river not visibly changed or degraded by modern development. This is a truly remarkable natural environment, devoid of river-side structures, as are present on most Missouri streams. While some visitors to this park may be loud and rowdy, they are always still WOWED by the river's wild life and gushing cold water springs. Providing the best tourist experience and preserving the natural beauty of the area many times conflict. Caring rangers and naturalists, through structured programs in surrounding communities such as Eminence, Salem, Bunker, Ellington, Van Buren, etc. should educate locals about the essential preservation of our streams and rivers that supply us with such a beautiful and unique environment. It is only when local river users understand the great jewel of nature that we have

in this park to be treasured by and for us and for future generations, will more distant visitors see how much we value the area and work with us to protect and preserve our park. I may not agree with all the provisions of Plan B, but it has a nice balance for preserving the area and providing a positive visitor experience for a myriad of uses.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 586 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,06,2014 20:02:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I often use the Current and Jacks Fork and Eleven Points River. While I only travel them via kayak or canoe, I am not in the least bothered by fishermen whether they are in power boats or human powered craft. I think the rivers are managed in a great way currently and think that restricting power boats more than they currently are is unnecessary and overly intrusive to the locals and others who use these rivers. I also think the safety factor could be affected by restricting power boats. Thanks for listening and allowing my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 587 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,06,2014 20:07:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Why can't you just leave things as they are? If this is for the public then why don't you just let the public use it. Why do you think you can manage things better than we can. We don't want to destroy something we enjoy. We know how to take care of our resources. Just leave us alone!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 588 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,06,2014 22:19:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a frequent visitor to Ozark NSRW, I'm very excited to see a more robust management plan. I really like the proposals to limit development, motor boats, ATV's, and unlawful river crossings. This river is one of our best assets in Missouri and should be left in as natural of state as possible. I urge you to strongly consider and adopt management proposal A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 589 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,06,2014 23:58:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It is apparent that much thought and effort have gone into the reports detailing the proposed regulation of the Current and Jacks Fork rivers in south-central Missouri. Although I am a sometime active member of three different organizations, I believe I am representative of the non-affiliated citizen who has experienced frequent use of these river areas. My experience includes probably 150 to 200 river trips over 50 years on the Current, Jacks Fork, and North Fork in south-central MO, the Buffalo River in northern Arkansas, and many trips on the floatable areas of Swan Creek, Beaver Creek, and Bull Creek in the past 28 years as a resident of Taney County, MO. My original experience started at age 12, in 1962, on Sugar Creek near Pineville, MO, as a Boy Scout from Parsons, KS, my hometown. I also floated the Elk River in 1971 from Noel, MO all the way to Grand Lake in Oklahoma, with a large group of college friends from Enid, Oklahoma. Many of the floats in the early years were with my rather large family of uncles from Kansas, often with 8 to 10 canoes. We always respected the rivers and the landowners when we floated.

At the age of 60 I participated in the Missouri River 340, the race from Kansas City to St. Charles, 340 miles, in 61 hours. Most of my kayak/canoeing in the past 25 years have been either alone or with one other person, and I cherish the memory of all those floats on these beautiful Ozark streams, which are a national treasure. I would venture to say that my experiences over the years have led me to an intense admiration and desire for the preservation of these areas for future generations, and promoted my interest in the Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, and the National Arbor Society. I am also a veteran of over 1100 organized races in running, bicycling, kayak/canoeing, triathlons, adventure races, and other multi-sport races. I am passionate about the preservation of wilderness areas and believe that they must be protected aggressively. One story, among many I have about the river floats I have experienced: One late September day about 20 years ago I put in at the Current starting at Akers with my bicycle lashed to the front of my kayak and overnight gear. I floated to an area above Big Springs and set up camp for the night. About dusk, my reverie was interrupted by a group of ATV 4-wheelers who were obviously drinking and shooting off guns as well as tearing across a low-water shoals. I decided not to engage them, as I do not carry weapons. My preference would be that this kind of activity would be unlawful, as it put a dent in my enjoyment of the serenity of my trip and was probably damaging to the river. My preference would be the more severe protection of the Current and Jacks

Fork areas as outlined by the Sierra Club. Thank you for listening, and again, thank you for your hours of planning and investigation into this sacred and beautiful watershed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 590    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 05:16:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a lifelong horse owner and trail rider, I support the no-action alternative. Riding the beautiful trails in Eminence and surrounding communities has been a bright spot in my life. Closing ANY current horse trails would be a tragedy. Loss of any horsetrails could not only affect trail riders, but the financial support we bring to the local communities. Being a member of Back Country Horsemen, I support the safekeeping and upkeep of the current horsetrail system and continuing education to protect them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 591    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 07:57:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I agree the Current river is in need of changes but banning boats off of a strip of river that seldom has boats except in the winter for gigging, and then that no where compares to canoe traffic. To ban boats to solve the problem is like heating a hot tub with a candle.

If you want to really save this river, more practical measures will be needed. For instance, limit or ban canoes along with boats, and horses at least from above Cedar Grove to Akers, ban horses from entering the water. I think a nice gesture would be to permit the seniors and disabled to ride ATVS on designated trails. They are not going to be tearing up jack. Gravel and chat spreading is filling up all the holes of water, sure it makes access points look attractive but when a flood comes, its all washed down, and then here comes the dump trucks full of gravel again.

I have lived on this river for 64 years, own land adjoining the river, worked on the river for three years. If changes aren't made, The Current may soon look like the Gladden river. I wade and fish the river a lot, Im so shocked at the way the fishing holes are disappearing. I have sat down at Cedar Grove and counted 30 or more horses in the water stomping and messing, while children are swimming below them. Hundreds of canoes with people wearing the banks off.

I hope you can come up with a genuine way of helping this crippled river, we have loved it to death.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 592    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 08:31:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Vote for Plan A!!! A, A, A!!!!

Let's make the river a destination worth visiting. I spend my tourist dollars at safe, clean, natural places where I feel good about taking my kids.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 593    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 08:39:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Our family is very upset that you would want to stop gravel bar cammping on Current River. We have been doing this for years I am 39 and have only missed two times one cause I was having one of our children. One of our cousin started this at least 50 years ago And may Stan R.I.P. we just lost him last year and no matter if you havent talk to anyone you know when we will be down their cause its the same time every year it is our family tradition every year Some go down for the weekend and some of us for a week or more. We have had anywhere from 25 to a 125 family members their at one time. We have grown up down their and sometimes would spend a whole month down their. We were rasied to respect the land and the river. We were taught you leave it cleaner then what it was when you got their. You dont litter the river and if you see trash you better pick it up even if its not yours. We have been to many different river to float on and Current is far most the best one. It is the cleanness and never crowed like the others. I couldnt tell you how many times we have yelled at people on other rivers to clean up after their self and we always have extra trash bags so their trash can go in it. I think you would need to invest in taking care of the other scenic river ways and focus on the problem areas and leave our little place of heaven alone. You should concentrate on educating the public of the proper ways on the river like we were rasied to and our children and grandchildren are being raised to. Why should the ones that respect the river and the land suffer for the ones that abuse our natural resoures. I can tell you in the last 7 years we have had 2 park ranges come where

we camp and one of those times was when we were in the drought to tell us no fires which we didnt have. I remember when I was growing up the park ranger would at least come down once a day and they would know some of the older ones by name they would sometimes eat with us and talk to us forever it seems like. And doesnt our tax money pay for National Parks so I just cant imagine how you can tell us where we can go last time I looked are we not the land of the free. So you just need to leave the ones alone that respect the river and worry about the ones that dont. Thank you for taking the time to read my letter I could go on and on on this matter.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 594 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,07,2014 09:13:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am for keeping motor boats on the upper Current and Jacks Fork River year around because the Park Service is never on the river when there is an emergency so someone with a motor boat has to help the people in trouble.(Local citizen with a motor boat.) I have seen this happen several times. I have been involved in helping people several times to keep them from drowning.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 595 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,07,2014 09:40:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Being able to drive into a gravel bar, camp and pole fish all night from the gravel bar was a family tradition of my family. My mom , dad, brother and I did this frequently. By allowing people to continue this tradition will spread out camping throughout the park system.

When my son was in the boy scouts we would drive into gravel bars and camp in pup tents, cook, and fish with a bon fire. This is another tradition that will be lost if driving into gravel bars and camping is prohibited.

Please allow us to drive into gravel bars and camp so we can keep this tradition.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 596 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,07,2014 09:54:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The economic impact of restricting horse trails will hurt the economy of Shannon County. Since I have a business that depends on use of horseback riders, I feel the NPS should improve existing horse trails not close any of them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 597 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,07,2014 10:10:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Restricting the number of non-motorized watercraft at specific landing points will harm the economy of local businesses. There will be less people camping and using local canoe rentals, motels, grocery stores, restaurants, gas stations, etc.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 598 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,07,2014 10:35:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Please protect our great rivers that our so clean and clear; they are, an asset to the Missouri economy and a treasure for its residents. We are obligated to protect these rivers, for they are a gift from God. To not protect these rivers, so that a few wealthy my profit, at the expense of most Missourians and their children would be a sin. In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. These rivers are of the earth created by God and a gift from God, so would it not be rude of us not to take care of these gifts; or for that matter, any gifts from any one. Let's not be rude to God and take from our children; Protect our rivers now, so our children may enjoy them as we now do.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 599 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,07,2014 10:48:36



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a frequent visitor to and admirer of the scenic river way of the Current River and Big Springs, unique water systems in the world, we support an aggressive plan to preserve the Scenic Riverways in the US, especially those unique, tremendous rivers in MO.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 600 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,07,2014 11:40:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There should be no change. I grew up spending every weekend on the Current River. I return with my children as often as I can. I do not feel that any change proposed would improve my experience on Current River.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 601 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,07,2014 12:28:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Friends,

Our family began enjoying the Jacks Fork and Current rivers some 40 years ago. The pristine waters and wilderness left lifelong impressions that I cherish to this day. Not having floated either river in recent years, I was saddened and dismayed to see so many images of encroachment, posted by MO Sierra Club- -auto access, ATVs, horses, home construction, etc. It is a essential paradox, but allowing unfettered access to these rivers in essence means that through over-use and abuse NO ONE may eventually be free to enjoy that which we have thus destroyed. For the good of ALL, this abuse must be stopped.

For several generations we've been reminded by Emerson, Thoreau, Muir, and so many others that "in wilderness is the preservation of society." My fervent hope is that those responsible for determining how to preserve the natural heritage represented by these two rivers- -a gift and heritage we are charged to pass on to future generations- -will rise above mundane considerations of politics or profits, thinking long-term to preserve for our children and children's children, and beyond, what is surely a sacred inheritance of wonder and beauty.

I support therefore "Plan B," but would even more support "Plan A" to provide maximum protection for the Current and Jacks Fork rivers.

I would remind those making this decision that if they allow the Jacks Fork or Current rivers to die from human abuse, something inside them will die as well. I've experienced "living water" in sacred places like Big Spring, as billions of gallons of cold, crystal clear refreshment gushes from the deeps. I hold these memories as holy, and pray that your actions will preserve those places for others to encounter their own connectivity to all that is.

Sincerely, in hope,

James Hannah

---

**Correspondence ID:** 602 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,07,2014 13:26:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to comment in support of Alternative A, which would close non-designated horse trails and prevent access by motor vehicles to gravel bars. I did a memorable float trip down the Current in the past and have visited both rivers several times for photography and sightseeing. They are true national treasures and deserve the highest level of protection, especially against uses that can degrade the visitors' experience by promoting unsightly erosion and stream damage.

Thanks for your work on this issue and for protecting our natural areas.

Randy Tindall

---

**Correspondence ID:** 603 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,07,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** On behalf of the rivers, and all the joy our family has with them - Thank you for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. I think that adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo.

Nevertheless I think that Alternative B does not go far enough. I recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers including road closures and undesignated horse trails, and restoration.

Most importantly, Alternative A:

- \*Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;

- \*Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and

- \*adds no new stream crossings;

- \*Hoofprints are particularly destructive - and we don't need any more crossings!!

- \* Bars vehicle access to gravel bars - this is awful when we're on the river and an ATV comes charging thru, making tire tread tracks and noise...

We love peaceful canoe times on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. These are national treasures, for sure.

I'd appreciate your response...thanks again!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 604 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,07,2014 14:37:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern:

After reviewing the proposed management plans for the Current and Jacks, I would like to voice my support for plan A. Plan B, a pragmatic compromise, one that seeks to please as many as possible while still attempting to protect the river, would be my second choice. Plan C is simply unacceptable to me.

For nearly 30 years, I have enjoyed the Current and Jacks. During that time, I have seen both rivers change quite a bit, and not for the better. Increases in the number of roads, number of horse trails and number of visitors have all taken their toll and both the aquatic environment and wilderness experience have suffered. Indicator species like the Hellbender seem to validate this. It saddens me to think that my children are unlikely to see an Ozarks Hellbender in the wild.

A true wilderness experience is something that is becoming harder to find, particularly in the midwest, where roads, access and "use" mentality are so prevalent. My childhood memories of these rivers are just that, distant memories.

More recent experiences with the Current and Jacks contrast greatly with the river I remember. Last time I floated on a weekend, my family had to contend with some very lewd behavior. Not trying to sound pretentious, but when I take the family to a National Park we should not have to contend with boobs and beads, drunks and their trash or sailor-ennivous language. Sounds more like a strip club than a National Park. I've not encountered this type of behavior in other parks, many of which I have visited. In fact, I even worked as an Interpretive Ranger in Sequoia National Park for several years. This type of behavior was simply not tolerated, nor should it be here.

Over the years, I've made a few observations regarding this river riff raff; they don't like weekdays, they don't like the cold and they don't like to carry much in their boat other than a cooler. Based on these observations, we no longer float on the weekends and stick to the weekdays. We avoid the summer months and take to the river in the off season. And lastly, we carry all of our equipment in our boat and low impact camp on gravel bars. This strategy has successfully helped us avoid the aforementioned behaviors. Problem is, it looks like all three of the management plans ban gravel bar camping.

This effectively means that everyone using the river will have to camp in a campground or enjoy the river for day use only. This seems unacceptable to me. National Parks have always been a low cost source of family recreation, yet under these plans, everyone now has to pay for camping. Yes, there will be free primitive camping in designated areas, non of which seem to be on or near the river. So much for my plan to "get away from it all" and enjoy a quiet night from a star-filled gravel bar.

Not only will the gravel bar camping ban affect my family, it will also affect my job. I work with at risk, court

adjudicated teens. In the summer months, we routinely take them on canoe trips. These trips seem to be quite beneficial to them. Many suffer from substance abuse issues and this, combined with safety and security issues, relegate us to gravel bars. Under these new plans, it appears that this is no longer acceptable. Again, this saddens me.

It seems that there ought to be some middle ground here. Issuing limited gravel bar camping permits seems like one possibility and then look at other regulations like fire pans, low impact requirements, etc. I doubt that the wheel would need to be re-invented. There are plenty of other parks that have such regulations already.

"Can't have it both ways" you may say. You can't ask for stricter management with Plan A, yet still allow gravel bar camping. Yet, I would disagree. For the most part, gravel bar campers are much like backpackers. They tend to have higher levels of respect for the environment and behave in ways that demonstrate that respect. They are not the ones who litter gravel bars with trash and feces, nor are they the one's who incessantly curse. Spend a day on the river and observe the boats with camping gear versus only coolers and I think you would agree. In short, folks that camp on the river have a better wilderness ethic. It seems that this is type of person you want to attract, not deter.

For too many years, the Current and Jacks have been neglected. Every time I go, there seems to be a new access that doesn't look "official" or accesses that get larger and larger. The explosion of unofficial horse trails continues to go unchecked. And the reputation as "party rivers" continues to be a problem. It appears that these are the areas to focus on, not the lowly gravel bar camper who is fairly environmentally conscious to begin with.

I appreciate your time and consideration in this matter. It is my sincere hope that the new management plan will reflect a new approach to managing the Current and Jacks; one that puts the rivers needs first, those with some wilderness ethic second and those with little to none last. This approach is most reflected in plan A, with plan B the second choice.

I look forward to hearing your decision.

Sincerely,  
Kyle Bentley

---

**Correspondence ID:** 605    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 15:00:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe that the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers would be best looked after by the State of Missouri. I feel our State has a vested interest in these natural resources and will do a better job than any National Park service out of Washington DC.

Our family canoes both rivers most every year and sometimes 2 or 3 times per year. We like to be able to drive up near the waters edge to put our canoes in. Since I am a disabled Vet it is important to me to gain access to the river and get into our canoe that it be close to the waters edge,for I do not have the strength I once had since I used much of it protecting our nation and it's people.

Thank you for your work and concern for our states natural resources. May God bless you.

Sincerely,

Richard Warner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 606    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 15:03:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The best thing the goverment do is leave things the way they are now.All the goverment will do is screw things things up.The land belongs to the people,i.e.the citizens,for we the people ARE the goverment.You work for us.Its high time you remember that.Quit trying to deny citizens their right to enjoy the land

that belongs to the public.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 607 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 15:11:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** First of all I want to thank the park service for a well done and thoughtful analysis of the Current river and Jack's Fork river management.

My family and I have spent much time on these rivers for at least four generations. In the last thirty years we have noticed serious degradation of these rivers, very sad to see. We feel that we must take a strong pro-active stance on saving these rivers from any further damage. Not just for the enjoyment of future generations but for our very survival. We all depend on intact eco-systems for our food. Without intact eco-systems, we will have no pollinators, no clean water, no air to breathe, it's all alive and it's all connected.

I request the adoption of the "Alternative A" plan as the most sensible plan for the health of our rivers.

Sincerely,  
Shelly Knichel

---

**Correspondence ID:** 608 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 16:03:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you to the National Park Service for putting together such a thoughtful analysis of this important issue. I am also a member of the National Parks Association, so I am aware of your interest in such an area as the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. And although your recommended adoption of Alternative B would be a big step forward, this plan does not really go far enough in its protection of the rivers. Alternative A would provide additional protection.

Having spent many years living in Missouri and taking a number of float trips on both the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers, I feel they need the strongest protection possible from those who carelessly harm the natural surroundings and pollute the rivers simply for their own recreational pleasure. Alternative A would close illegal roads and restore natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads; it would close 65 miles of undesignated horsetrails and add no new stream crossings; and, it would bar damaging, loud, and polluting vehicle access to gravel bars.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 609 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 16:07:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am impressed with the thought and effort that has gone into this report. I prefer Alternative A. It seems to lessen damage from growth and development and would work to keep the rivers as much in their natural state as possible.  
Since my husband and I have retired, we have floated and camped on the Current and Jacks Fork for a few days once a year and hope to continue to do that.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 610 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B would be a big positive step forward from the status quo.  
I believe that Alternative B does not go far enough and instead recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance,  
Alternative A:  
- Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;  
- Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings;  
- Bars vehicle access to gravel bars.  
As an avid canoeist and camp leader in the area, we are often upset with the condition of our gravel bars with deep ruts from vehicles running through the area destroying plants and the natural landscape.  
Protect the most important of our natural resources and limit the access.

Thank you again for your work on preserving our rivers.  
Mary Jo Wilmes

---

**Correspondence ID:** 611    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 16:41:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I kayaked on the Current River for three days this past summer (from Round Spring to Owls Bend)

I think that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways should keep up the good work. The Park Service should manage the park to keep motorized vehicles, and gasoline generators, away from the river bank. These eyesores reduce the scenic value of the rivers. I heard generators running on the right bank near Two Rivers.

I congratulate the Park for shutting the illegal boat access on the right bank by the big clearing that the wild horses use. I saw the wild horses there two, and it was amazing.

I support the strictest level of protection for the Park, which would be Alternative A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 612    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 16:50:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I kayaked on the Current River this past July for 3 days. I go there at least once per year for kayaking and hiking. As a lifelong Missourian, I want to see this park protected to the same standards as other National Parks, like Yellowstone.

I spent a week in North Cascades National Park, and that park was well-maintained.

Meanwhile, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is allowed to deteriorate from excessive horse traffic, ATVs in the river, scenic easements that are ignored, and unauthorized accesses.

I support Alternative A, which would provide the strongest protection for the river!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 613    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 19:52:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please leave the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in their natural state. They are so very beautiful as they are. Any more human activity would spoil their natural beauty.

Debby

---

**Correspondence ID:** 614    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 21:26:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe it is of the utmost importance to protect our waterways by adoption of Alternative A to provide additional protections for the rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 615    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 21:26:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I do understand conflict with boaters and floaters and try to enjoy both. I live on the river here every weekend all summer. I have had bad to border line dangerous experiences with both. Mystery to me is where is law enforcement other than along the 4 mile stretch at bridge out of scenic riverways. Everyone knows that's where all the tubers are and should be no wake zone other than Emergency after 10 am. Now if motorboats are such a problem WHY restrict them along scenic riverways where there are fewer floaters. Don't get me wrong though I've been run off

the river by careless imprudent drunken ignorant boaters in fear of my safety and passengers. Why can't state laws be enforced why do I have to be restricted for other people's ignorance. Common sense is No, one needs a 300hp motor on this river however it is grand to be able take grandparents and grandchildren for a boatride together can be experience with old stories the grandkids will never forget and carry on. So from experience I know can manage that boatride with 150hp easily with 6 people. Ok with 1 or 2 people in 150hp it can be too fast on this small river how about a speed limit and ENFORCE it. Another concern if motor size is restricted along scenic riverways won't everyone with a large motor have to use their boats in the 4 mile unrestricted stretch at the Van Buren bridge where all the tubers are. Yeah think there's conflict now. Makes a person wonder if we aren't using the boaters against the floaters like wise to shut it all down? Is that the goal? I would feel so much better to see laws enforced just like on the highways rather than everyone be restricted from driving a boat. I do both just don't understand why boaters are made out to be the villain. Can't remember how many tubers and canoers I've rescued in a motor boat. Maybe there isn't a happy medium and no one can get along without all having restrictions forced on them?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 616    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 21:55:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I favor the management plan B.

Although I have only visited the park in the "off" season in order to avoid crowds most often visiting in October I think B is the best usage for all people that want to use the park.

I especially like the proposal to consider/ study a wilderness area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 617    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 22:58:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** FYI:

Earlier today I submitted a public comment largely based on page 146 table 13 of the 534 page EIS/management plan regarding the Current and Jacks Fork rivers and camping on gravel bars. This evening, while conferring with a friend, we discovered discrepancies between this table and table 13 of the 22 page plan overview.

Wondering which one is correct and whether this discrepancy has caused any confusion in relationship to the public comments. Clearly, the differences in language could lead to quite different interpretations of these plans. Based on this, I would recommend extending the public comments period to allow for corrections, particularly since the last public meetings were cancelled.

Please let me know what your decision is regarding this confusion.

Kyle Bentley

---

**Correspondence ID:** 618    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 05:24:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is a comment on the recently canceled three meetings on the future of Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

Is there anyway that either a 30 day, 15 day advance notification can be given for the meeting to replace the ones canceled for a better planning of upcoming activities for myself and others? I only got a 1 day notice, but was prepared to go, at a drop of a pin here today. So please give a notice, further in advance, than what had been given. A notification on the Facebook page would help out too.

Thanks for the 'heads up' on the prior one..

---

**Correspondence ID:** 619    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 07:50:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly support plan A which will limit the hp size and activity areas for motorized boats.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 620    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 08:11:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support wholeheartedly support alternative B, the preferred alternative. I encourage NPS to select it for implementation.

Regards,  
-Chance Finegan  
Waterloo, Iowa

---

**Correspondence ID:** 621    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 08:18:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** my family has been using the river since i was in grade school, i grew up in St Louis and live in Robertsville now less than 2 miles from Meramec river access, but we drive 2 hours to use the current river over 10 times per year camping, boating and fishing. under your new proposal our family wouldn't be able to use the river and i think it would be a terrible tragedy to be pushed out by someones idea about keeping it in a natural state. who is to benefit from keeping it in a natural state if your plan keeps out the people that use and love it? my family has participated in "river clean up day" and we do so every time we use it, not just when someone gets a group together for it. do the people suggesting this even live in Missouri or use the river? i hope that there is a plan put forth that benefits Missourians and people that love this resource instead of impressing some political agenda. please reconsider your proposal and make it possible for the majority of people who use and protect our most valuable resource to continue to enjoy it.

thank you Dan Arnold 314 607 3412

---

**Correspondence ID:** 622    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 08:59:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to express my support of PLAN A which will reduce the hp size and range of motorized craft on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers in Missouri. I was a resident of the state of Missouri for 4 years and still make frequent visits to the state and to the rivers indicated and I know first-hand how fragile the environmental balance is on those and other rivers. It is my opinion that any form of motorized craft would ruin the pristine nature of those rivers and would impact their long term economic value and a tourist destination and other recreation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 623    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 09:46:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Plan A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 624    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 09:55:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I urge the NPS to select PLAN A to reduce the hp size and range of motorized craft on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers in Missouri.  
Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 625    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 10:03:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have lived in Missouri all of my life. Many years ago I owned property near Akers Ferry and the Current River. The river was always a very clean and peaceful place. A place where you could experience the natural beauty and wonder of nature in our state. I have seen it changing as the years have gone by. There are more motorized boats and vehicles, people are building on scenic easements, there is overuse of commercialized horse

traffic, and overall overcrowding of people who are abusing this beautiful river way. These are problems that must be addressed and corrected to the greatest extent. I feel strongly that something needs to be done before the damage goes so far that it cannot be remedied. I am asking you all to do what is best for our state and our national scenic river way. I do appreciate that the National Park Service trying to put together a solution to these problems, but I do not believe that adopting Alternative B would be to the best interest in saving and preserving the beauty of our natural wilderness. I would like to see Alternative A adopted as I see that it adds additional protection to our river ways. Once we lose our natural wilderness it can never be regained. It is a known fact that being in nature benefits humans health in many ways. It is our responsibility to save and preserve these natural wilderness areas for the generations to come. Please choose wisely in adopting the right Alternative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 626    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 10:28:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** i support Plan A

---

**Correspondence ID:** 627    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 10:56:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The thing that bothers me is the wilderness part. Just how big an area are you talking about? Since my wife and I are seniors now, I don't like the idea of closing roads. Walking long distances are now a problem. My wife and I did nine float trips on the Current River this past summer, and we loved every minute. I see the need for stewardship of the area. I can remember when there was a guided tour john-boat trip from the Big Spring Lodge. I wish it was back again. I thank you for your work in the area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 628    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 11:34:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Having perused the draft management plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, I most strongly agree with Alternative A.  
I have witnessed (may 2011) excessive numbers of canoers (every 10yards 1-2 canoes)in the Eminence area, as well as drinking and lewd behavior. I feel strongly that there needs to be more stringent enforcement of existing legislation to ensure an enjoyable family atmosphere. Don't let the outfitters self-regulate the number of canoes on the river at any given time.  
Secondly, I have seen rutting apparently caused by ATV running from bank to bank across the river. This destroys wildlife habitat and causes erosion and shitst the channel of the river in extreme cases. I realize that some individuals enjoy nature primarily for the seat of an ATV, but there are other areas where they can do this.  
Third, I see a need for a ranger-naturalist presence along the river, and or accompanying groups. I have witnessed trash (beer cans and bottles, plastic bags)loud music along the river. These instances need to be prevented through enhanced enforcement.  
Finally, I urge you to take these comments into account. God forbid there should ba nother senseless murder along our rivers, but the situation between nearby landowners and floaters has gotten out of hand.

Sincerely

Don Evans

---

**Correspondence ID:** 629    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 11:58:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I hope that alternative A is selected. Keeping that area as close to a natural wilderness is the most attractive and reasonable choice. We need more such areas in the U.S. and especially in Missouri. More extensive use, especially with motorized equipment is just spoiling this beautiful river systems. And allowing horses in the river is not much better. Restricted, environmentally sound use is what is needed.

Thanks, Bernard Waxman

---



**Correspondence ID:** 630    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 12:29:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I first saw the Current River in the late 50s on a home movie screen to the clatter of my father's 16mm projector. He had gone back home to Missouri on a beloved fishing expedition- skinny john boats, skinnier river guides, great footage of the boys going down the river fishing. Never did I, a girl raised in Chicago suburbs, dream that one day I would be living on that river, and subsequently several others in Missouri.

I lived on the Current River in for a decade in the 70s, and learned to love the wild springs, root-wads, caves, whirlpools, eddies, flora, fauna, and backwaters that make up that part of the Ozark Scenic Riverways. We had a 25 horse motor for the boat, we had canoes. We used the gravel bars to camp, and tried to leave only a footprint or two. Sometimes joined in on the big fish-fries and gigging season. I hardly recognize the place these days.

I advocate for Plan A .

I recently was honored to be on 2 private trips down the Colorado River from Lee's Ferry to Pearce Landing in the Grand Canyon. 24 nights out one year, 21 nights out this year; and the designated hiking and camping areas were pristine each time. LOTS of people go down that river each year, but thanks to regulation, it remains a wild thing of beauty. I am so saddened when I paddle down the rivers here at home and see diapers, cans, wall-to- wall rafts etc., hear the boom boxes and ATVs, just because it's the way we do it here. There aren't many streams as beautiful as our Ozark beauties. Let's keep them that way before it is too late.

During my years on that river, I met plenty of folks who had been born there in Carter County, whose ancestors had settled there. They are a proud and self-sufficient lot, and usually those people are not the ones who want to abuse what they have.

I just don't see the need for giant motors- perhaps a few licensed for rescue missions? I also don't see the the need for every single landowner to have a road directly to the river's edge. Or ATVs going everywhere on earth. I am also a trail horse owner, but have never set hoof in Eminence- Missouri was voted #1 Trail State of 2013- there are plenty of trails that don't disturb the environment like the ones do down there when masses pass through.

Please, oh, please, don't let the Ozark Scenic Riverways turn into the equivalent of a strip mall on our scenic byways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 631    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 12:30:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** After careful study of the ONSR Draft General Management Plan (Plan) I support the "no action option." It is unfortunate I have to come to this conclusion as there are many components of the Plan that I believe would be supported by the majority of the citizenry who comment on the Plan. What follows are comments citing pages that elicit a comment.

Pg. 39: "- partner with County and State to replace the Cedar Grove low-water bridge with a high-water bridge." This would be an extraordinarily good project and needs to move forward regardless of the outcome of this process. Low-water bridges are barriers to fish and aquatic as well as hazards to floaters. The Cedar Grove low-water bridge is well built but a barrier to fish and aquatic passage never-the-less. The US Fish and Wildlife Service funded the "Stream Crossings Posing Barriers to Aquatic Organism Movement: Bourbeuse River Watershed" as one of the definitive studies in Southern Missouri. I recommend this document to anyone wanting to read more about the effects of low-water bridges.

Pg. 39: "- improve park waste systems and partner with community about waste systems adjacent to riverways." Again, regardless of the outcome of the Plan, the NPS needs to lead and promote improved waste systems within the ONSR watershed, including private septic and lagoon systems. The Top of the Ozarks Resource Conservation & Development managed a Missouri DNR grant a few years ago that made improvements to private septic systems in the Jacks Fork River Watershed and the model is worth replicating. In addition, the ONSR needs to install more vault toilets at locations along the river. When I have been part of river cleanups I noted areas where many floaters stop to relieve themselves. These should be target areas for vault toilets and be marked on maps used by outfitters as well as with signage. None of the arguments against these installations holds up to scrutiny as there are always sites

above the flood plain and the occasional old service road to be reactivated to service the toilets. Signage may need replacing after high-water events but I trust NPS Maintenance can figure that out. Presently the ONSR Rangers find those areas where floaters stop to relieve themselves as places to write tickets. If the Rangers can identify and get to those locations certainly planners can too when locating new vault toilets.

Pg. 41: "Improve Park Operations: Organize a Park Advocacy Group." Certainly a good idea. Not a good idea to see such a group as under the thumb of park managers and with the function of raising money for ONSR. As a Stream Team member and equestrian, I would like to be part of such a group, as long as we had autonomy and functioned not merely as NPS puppets. Believe it or not the general public, park users and neighbors of the ONSR have good ideas and would love to be part of an inclusive advocacy group.

Pg. 69: The options within the Plan change ever so subtly from beginning to end. I comment here on equestrian usage:

1. "-close 20 access points and design and open 20 new access points." There are many access points that are severely eroded and a hazard to horses and their riders. There has not been any prohibition, as far as I know, about ONSR partnering with equestrian groups to close problem crossings and install signage at proper crossings. Why hasn't this been done?

2. "Horse trails: 25 miles of additional trails and 65 miles of undesignated trails closed." Again, why hasn't the ONSR been working with equestrian groups to shut down junk trails and install signage that directs horse riders to the proper trails? Without maps a rider finds him/herself suckered into a trail that should not be in use. Worse, the ONSR Maintenance does not patrol trails to remove fallen trees from trails and so riders create new trails around the blockages. I'm sure that 10's of miles of undesignated trails are created by the lack of ONSR maintenance. Signage? Ask us, we'll help you! One more burr under my saddle: doesn't anyone within the ONSR pick up trash along trails anymore? I know that Rangers and anyone with a GS-9 or more is above picking up trash, but really people, don't you think you could at least partner with groups willing to get their hands dirty??

Pg. 70: "- undesignated NPS roads, traces, crossings, and river access points would be closed." Which ones? How many? The Plan goes on to say "Law enforcement would be increased for compliance." This seems to be the mindset of NPS. A lack of planning and cooperating with local groups will be offset by guns and badges. Has anyone studied the history of land acquisition along the ONSR? Nerves are still raw about the roughshod treatment given to landowners. Compliance by badge, gun and citation isn't a real good plan.

Pg. 77: Alternate C: 45 miles of new trails including new crossings sounds good; tell us more. A 25-campsite horse camp along the Jacks Fork River is an excellent idea. Close 65 miles of undesignated trails: again, show us the map of those trails to be closed. Create 23-miles of improved trails to discourage creation of social trails: show us where; allow us to work with planners; the ONSR could have been doing this all the while and certainly cheaper by using equestrian groups as the labor. Install signage and 99% of riders will ride the designated trails.

Pg. 90: Sustainable Design & Aesthetics: new buildings need to be constructed to minimize energy and water usage, have eastern and southern exposure orientation for passive heat gain and avoid overheating from western sun exposure.

Pg. 91: Trail Construction Materials: "add" no asphalt used in 500-year flood plain; use of asphalt only after public notice and comments received that asphalt to be used on a trail project.

Pg. 97: "Citations for inappropriate behavior: If standard violated, managers might consider closing areas of concern." Could the writers of the Plan have used any more incendiary language to rile up the locals?? Who gets to measure and decide? Did I miss something or am I mistaken that the ONSR belongs to the citizens of the US?

Would it not work to increase Ranger presence at areas and times of heavy use? This is where I am adding my own anecdote: I travel across the Ozarks regularly and stop at Alley Mill for lunch or breaks. One late fall day there was a family with an out-of-state vehicle and myself at the gravel parking lot adjacent to the mill. As I returned from a relaxing walk around the spring I heard the family getting rounded up in a hurry to leave. As I looked up the gravel lot I saw a Ranger parked crossways in the lot "glaring" at us for being there. The family heard the message loud and clear, "get out!" Knowing the mindset of NPS Rangers from years working NPS Seasonal Maintenance, I knew we were violators of his domain and probably committed some violation he hadn't seen- yet. As I sauntered up the lot to get a clearer understanding of the Rangers problem he thought better of his situation and took off. I documented the situation with Russ Runge.

Pg. 100: Table 8: "Bacteria Actions, temporary closure, permits for horse use, permanent closures." A number of years ago the ONSR and Missouri DNR funded a bacteria study. I happen to be a friend of the Heath Department employee in charge of the study. Both the ONSR and DNR were convinced that horses were the predominant cause of high bacteria counts. Indeed, it was found that after high visitor usage by equestrians and floaters bacteria counts spiked, but the river cleared up fast. The study showed that high usage by floaters was more problematic but the funding was stopped for the study as it did not agree with the opinions of ONSR and DNR managers. Again, install

vault toilets at strategic locations as most people prefer a toilet over a trek through the poison nettle.

Pg. 103: "NPS would immediately close undesignated crossings." I would caution managers that they need to work with equestrian and adjacent horse camps to sign and improve appropriate crossings BEFORE closing undesignated crossings. Aren't all equestrian crossings undesignated now?

Pg. 126: Table 13. Summary of Key Differences. All the Alternatives have negatives for equestrians. If the ONSR staff would work with users I'm sure we could pick the favorable parts from the Alternatives, but as they are presented they are all unacceptable.

Pg. 165: "2006 Study- -elevated bacteria levels Jacks Fork River- -attributed to horses and other land uses." Again, the study identified problems with horses but there are more problems from high usage events by people. Further, we have identified cattle and poor logging and agriculture practices as major sources of bacteria and nutrients in other watersheds.

Pg. 202: Visitor Characteristics "- the most severe issue was litter or trash." Even though this was learned from NPS surveys, a serious discussion of how to deal with litter and trash is missing from the Plan. Missing-In-Action from Stream Team river cleanups on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers are ONSR Staff. The Plan would have the reader believe that more Rangers are needed as this is an enforcement issue. The ONSR needs to have more Maintenance Staff on the river doing trash cleanup. Further, the ONSR needs to work with other watershed partners in Missouri to get a bottle law passed. The majority of trash found in Southern Missouri river cleanups are recyclable aluminum beer cans. Increase the redemption value and we will have less trash in the river.

Pg. 207: "77.3% o horse respondents- -lack of trail markers/signs- -getting lost." The ONSR could have been installing signs, closing junk horse trails and problem crossings all these years, and with the help of equestrian groups! Pay attention to the surveys, the public you serve is trying to tell you something.

Pg. 211: Table 24 has a 6-year average for violations, alcohol 355, drugs 256, littering 18; I'm afraid citations for litter are not glamorous. Further, isn't giving cautionary advice to young people about alcohol and drug usage better than citations that hurt future education and job prospects? Are the NPS Rangers our last hope for moral behavior in this country? Another anecdote: in dealing with NPS outfitters I found one fit to be tied due to outrage. It seems that he picked up a group of St. Louis teenage biology club students after a float who were cited for open bottles/underage possession of alcohol. The students were picking up trash and certainly had a lot of open bottles and cans that once contained alcohol. Never mind they were picking up trash, they shouldn't have been caught with empties! The outfitter identified a Seasonal Ranger who was trying to make an impression with management. As a retired federal employee I resent the stupidity of anyone in federal employment painting other federal employees with the stupid brush.

Pg. 347: Alternate C, what is the timing? Closing trails and crossings is only palatable after new crossings and trails are created as well as the 25-campsite horse camp is open; only then should closing happen with assistance from horse camp owners and equestrian groups.

The Plan then introduces "a horse trail permit system might be implemented- -." This is a non-starter. Unless the ONSR is prepared to deal with a great deal of civil disobedience you should drop this language.

Pg. 417: Water Quality- -there is no mention of more vault toilets.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	632	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,08,2014 13:34:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom it may concern,				

I would like to voice my interest in and concern for the plan for the Current River and its watershed. I favor protecting as much of the riparian zone and watershed as possible and would like to see less concentration of access and less engineered manipulation of the riverbank or riparian zone. We need to protect this incredible resource and keep it as wild as we can. I concede that we must allow people to visit, to enjoy, and to use the river and the area around it, but the focus must be on protection and preservation where possible and prevention where necessary. I have been canoeing on the Current river for over thirty years, so I too love to have access. But, unlimited, irresponsible use will rob us and future generations of the river that I have come to love.

I support the Missouri Coalition for the Environment position to prosecute easement violations, limit motor boating, and to back Alternative B with the stipulations they have outlined. Please protect this beautiful river and watershed, it is priceless and irreplaceable.

Darren O'Brien

---

**Correspondence ID:** 633    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 13:45:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I wish to register my strong support for your proposed management plan alternative A. My age is 66 years and I have been exploring and enjoying the outdoors all my life. I have travelled extensively in the US and have been all the while an avid hiker and canoeist.

I recently returned home from the second of two 21 day rafting trips in the Grand Canyon of the Colorado River. On both occasions I was able to see firsthand the effects of strict use management policy. The benefits of such strict management are obvious and far reaching, resulting in a wilderness experience of incomparably pristine quality. As we know, Grand Canyon access is severely limited by a permit process and many people wait years for the opportunity to raft the Colorado River. I would far rather enjoy one trip of very high quality than have free access to that resource in a much-diminished state due to heavy and poorly-restricted use.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is a resource with a different character, but equally unique and comparably important as a national treasure. It deserves as much care in stewardship as does the Grand Canyon of the Colorado River.

We must develop a management plan whose primary goal is the preservation of an undiluted, uncompromised condition of its original pristine character.

This resource of national significance belongs to all Americans. Just as in the case of our national highway system, for example, the building, maintenance, and management of its roads and bridges comes under the purview of the community at large, not just of those through whose home area the roads pass. In this case we are discussing the fate of a very unique national treasure. We must not rob from our children by subjecting the Ozark NATIONAL Scenic Riverways to further degradation.

Please implement alternative A as the management plan for Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

Sincerely  
Franz E Mayer  
Augusta, Mo.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 634    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 14:00:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a recent visitor to the Current River Section of the Ozark Trail, back in mid-October, 2013, I was very dismayed by the conditions of parts of the trail and, especially a gravel bar south of Powder Mill.

The gravel bar is approximately 2 miles south of Powder Mill Visitor's Center. We were attracted to Blue Springs and the beautiful bluffs across from the gravel bar. The gravel bar would have been a nice place to camp for a couple of weary backpackers, but we were so shocked by the condition of the gravel bar. It was rutted from vehicles driving right up to the water's edge. There were numerous large fire rings from camp fires and 2 gallon plastic containers that looked to be used for fueling the fires. There was also a barbecue grill on the bar. The whole scene was one of a very littered party area.

We were shocked to see such misuse and damage to such a fragile area, where a large spring discharges into the river and eagles fly up and down the river, even in mid-October. There is a road with too easy access to the gravel bar which needs to be permanently closed. As a canoeist or backpacker, I would not feel safe camping here on a weekend for fear of loud, destructive parties descending upon us. I can't imagine it being a safe place for a family outing on the river.

And, south of this section of river, along the Ozark Trail, we encountered horse manure along this stretch to Klepzig Mill. Horse use is not allowed on this stretch of trail.

When we camped near Klepzig Mill, we were all too aware of what sounded like poaching going on in the National Park land and the Conservation Area nearby. It was nightfall and we heard 3 separate, close rifle shots. The last shot occurred at 9:30 pm, followed by the sound of a truck along the nearby gravel road. We couldn't help but think that someone was out hunting with spotlights. Needless to say, we did not feel safe on this stretch of trail for the 5 days

we were out.

Upon returning to St. Louis, an article appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch about the high levels of ecoli in the Current River, the source of which is illegal horseback riding along the river. So our experiences of misuse is not isolated. We have a permanent eagle population down there that depend on clean water, not to mention the other wildlife and people who legally use the riverways.

I think Plan A is a better option for management of the rivers. BUT, it must be MANAGED. I realize the resources are not there for monitoring such a large area, but more could be done to mimic the management in other national parks. I would welcome closing roads to sensitive areas, especially gravel bars. Access to the river should be by foot or canoe, not vehicles. Motorized boats only add to pollution, but if they must have access, they need to be regulated. More family-oriented campgrounds could be managed by the park service, with fees enforced just as they are in other parks. I would welcome a park entrance fee, just as in other parks around the country. Roads leading to historical mills could be dead-end, making it harder for through traffic for illegal hunters.

The conditions I saw on this recent visit left me feeling that it was just not a safe and enjoyable visit. Access to the river must be limited, so that fewer access points could be better monitored. Though my preferred outdoor activity practices low-impact use, I'm not advocating that for everyone. But there really is no need, economically or recreationally, for destructive off-roading, large horsepower boating, illegal hunting, or horseback riding. Parks are for everyone, not just people seeking a joyride. Keep the rivers clean and family-friendly so that all may enjoy a wilderness experience on the waters. If law enforcement can monitor canoeist for excessive drinking, they can divert some time and energy to monitor illegal use of the waterways too.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 635    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 14:14:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** TO: National Park Service (NPS) and the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR)  
FROM: Phillip and Daniel Callahan  
1823 County Road 928  
Bunker, MO 63629  
Email: phillip.callahan@windstream.net and daniel.callahan@windstream.net  
Phone: 573-689-1237

**SUBJECT:** ONSR Draft General Management Plan/Wilderness Study/EIS Public Comment

Thank you for opportunity to provide public comment on the subject proposal. I grew up in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) and enjoyed countless hours of recreation there. My son Daniel is now 16 years old and is enjoying the same experiences in the ONSR as I did as a kid. We appreciate the opportunity to provide our comments and relay our personal experiences on one of Americas natural treasures.

#### BACKGROUND:

Over the past 44 years I have spent many days on the ONSR enjoying the diverse opportunities it has to offer. My son has spent the last two years enjoying the same things. In addition to that many of my family members and friends spend just about every weekend on the ONSR. I am very familiar with all that the ONSR has to offer. I have personally floated the ONSR in canoe from Cedar Grove to Two Rivers. I have boated many stretches of the river in a motorboat with both a 25 horsepower jet and a 60/40 jet, I have swam, waded, and floated tubes on various portions of the river. I have giggered from a 60/40 motorboat. I have floated in a non-motorized flat-bottom boat while fishing. I have fished from the shore. I have visited many of the caves and springs in the area and walked some of the hiking trails. I have road ATVs where permitted and also camped on the gravel bars. After reading the draft management plan, the only thing I see in it that I havent personally participated in is horseback riding. However, I do have friends who have. I would say this gives me a very broad and unique view on the opportunities available on the ONSR.

Additionally, I am a frequent user of many of our other National Parks; places like Glacier National Park, Yellowstone National Park, Voyagers National Park. I also take advantage of many similar locations that offer limited access; places like the Boundary Waters Canoe Area with non-motorized areas, MINGO Wildlife Refuge and Hamburg Bend Conservation Area limited to muzzleloader and archery hunting. I have a great appreciation for

the need to balance the protection of our natural resources and their use.

This is the perspective that I bring with my comments that follow. Having studied the full 534 page proposal, I have selected a few specific areas that I feel need consideration as this proposal is reviewed. This is not a comprehensive discussion on the proposal. I will focus my remarks to a few very specific areas that I feel are critically important as you consider this management proposal.

#### JUSTIFICATION:

The plan states, This new management plan for Ozark National Scenic Riverways is needed because the last comprehensive planning effort for the National Riverways was completed in 1984. I agree. It is important to consider strategic objectives every so often and this was likely overdue. However, the proposal fails to make a substantive argument for such a radical change in the management strategy. The proposal fails in four specific areas as discussed below:

- 1) The proposal says, Patterns and types of visitor use have changed& Yet this is not validated by the data contained within the report itself. The only substantive change in visitor activities noted in the proposal and based upon my personal experiences is the use of tubes to float the river vs canoes. While I agree this is a change, it is certainly not one that provides for a substantive or substantial change in overall impact to the resource itself or the other visitors to ONSR.
- 2) The proposal says, &technology has introduced opportunities for recreational activities and access not envisioned in the past. Yet, the proposal fails to identify and quantify these technologies or other opportunities.
- 3) The closest this proposal comes to a coherent justification for such a radical change in management strategy is what it describes as By far the most commonly expressed concerns in public scoping were related to visitor behavior. It is reported that, A recurring complaint by commenters was the growing amount of disrespectful and vulgar visitor behavior. Most commenters stated concerns about drug and alcohol use, and trash and litter along the rivers and surrounding lands. I agree that they may be an issue. However, in my personal experience these are largely isolated events and have little impact on the overall resource and rarely impact visitors. Regardless, this is not substantial justification to radical change the use habits of the majority of the visitors. Instead, a more logical approach would be to focus efforts on controlling and enforcing the questionable behavior.
- 4) Lastly, the proposal seeks to significantly limit public access to much of the ONSR. There is no substantial argument to justify this. The fact is visitor use has remained essentially stable at approximately 1,500,000 visits per year from 1973-2008 (ref: page 200, Figure 10). That is 30 years! The National Park Service (NPS) might have a reason to address usage rates if there were trends of increased usage that were putting unsustainable pressure on the natural resources or if the experience were becoming so unsatisfying that visitors quit coming to ONSR. Neither is true. I have enjoyed the ONSR since 1980. I spent two weeks there this summer and I can say without doubt that the resource is essentially unchanged from 1980. The resource is not suffering from the current use levels. Additionally, the visitor satisfaction survey cited in the proposal itself discounts negative visitor impacts. In fact, 84.2% i the survey said there was no need to limit amount of visitor use and 75% sid the ONSR was not excessively crowded. We know that no matter how few users there are, some will always say there are too many. Additionally, the 2010 study cited in the proposal stated the following: "Motorized and nonmotorized watercraft users were asked if other river users were a problem for them. Among motorboaters, 13.5% tought that other users were a problem, while only 3.9% o nonmotorized watercraft users perceived other users as a problem. These numbers clearly indicate the vast majority of visitors are happy with the current usage strategy.

#### FISCAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The NPS recommends Option B. Within that recommendation is the assertion that NPSs estimated cost to implement Option C will likely prevent its implementation. That is an excellent point. In the current budget environment we face in the Federal Government fiscal accountability is a paramount concern. So lets take a quick look at the projected cost of each proposal. According to Table 9 on page 114 (there is more data in Table 12 on page 116, however those numbers dont match Table 9 numbers and it is unclear if they are in addition to the Table 9 numbers), the additional cost for each option is listed below:

No-Action Option Option A Option B Option C

One-time facility costs	\$0	\$7,498,000	\$6,703,000	\$12,259,000
Annual operating costs	\$6,582,000	\$9,304,000	\$8,821,000	\$10,072,000
Increase	\$0	\$2,722,000	\$2,239,000	\$5,677,000
Full-time staffing increase	0	34	26	47

Total

As can be clearly seen if cost is an issue (and in this era of tight budgets better be), the option with the lowest cost is the No-Action Option. According to the charts provided in the report they claim approximately \$4,000,000 more additional cost in deferred maintenance for the No-Action Option, however that is not justified in the proposal. Options A-C then would cost an additional \$7-12M in one-time facility costs, \$2-6M per year additional operating costs, and 26-47 additional full-time equivalent positions at an extremely high personnel cost. Even if you estimate the FTEs at a low cost of \$50,000/year that amounts to an additional \$1.3-2.35M in cost per year.

Based upon these numbers I would agree with the NPS that Option Cs cost would likely prevent implementation. However, I would also argue that the costs of options A and B are significantly higher than the No-Action Option and are not substantially lower than Option C. According to the proposal, ONSR is currently only able to staff 72 of its 95 authorized positions and maintains a current backlog of deferred maintenance of \$27,083,000. If they cant find the funds to hire 23 currently authorized positions and pay for \$27M in needed maintenance, where would the greatly increased funding requirements for Options A-C come from, especially in a federal government budget that is looking to cuts funds wherever it can? Given that, it is illogical to pursue and adopt any management strategy as fiscally unsustainable as this one; thereby leaving the No-Action option as the only feasible option.

#### ADDITONAL ISSUES:

While the previous two issues are very significant, I do want to address a couple other issues of concern.

- 1) The alternative to limit gravel bar camping to designated gravel bars away from the river is unjustified. The proposal asserts that This would help minimize some riverbed disturbances, erosion, sedimentation, water quality degradation, and turbidity in many gravel bar areas. Anyone who has spent time on the river knows that the impact of a camper or tent on the gravel bar is extremely minor compared to the impact on these gravel bars with each spring flood. Every year the flood waters change these gravel bars. To suggest that my setting a tent and a small campfire or even an RV on the gravel bar has a negative impact is frankly unfounded. Ive watched these gravel bars for 30 years and know it is not true. As with many of the assertions in the report, there is no evidence proving this point.
- 2) The proposal to limit motorboat access to only the period between Labor Day and March 15th is unjust and unfair. Our rivers are for everyones enjoyment. There are a large percentage of ONSR users who do so in the summer months via their motorboats. According to the 2010 study cited in the proposal only 3.9% o other non-motorized users perceived other users (e.g. motorboat users) as a problem. Yes, there may be some isolated issues of conflict between motorboat users and non-motorized users but these are isolated and antidotal, not the norm. There is no sound justification within the proposal to limit motorboat usage beyond its current limits.
- 3) I take issue with the proposed watercraft usage numbers in Table 8, page 99. There is no justification or logic to these proposed numbers. The chart suggests 70 watercraft per mile for the upper sections (Cedar Grove to Pulltite) of the Current River and 10 watercraft per mile for the middle sections (Round Springs to Chilton Creek). This makes no sense. The river is much smaller and can support fewer watercraft in the upper sections. Additionally, much of that area has naturally extremely limited motorized boating opportunity. However the river is much larger/wider from Round Springs to Chilton Creek and can support more watercraft, including providing more opportunity for motorized watercraft. The current watercraft usage on the river is appropriate. Ive been there on weekends and weekdays both. Anyone wanting an more isolated opportunity to enjoy the river can do so very easily on a weekday. In fact I just spent this past labor day weekend camped at Bee Bluff for 4 days. The amount of canoes and motorized boats I saw was pretty small. They in no way detracted from my experience. I was able to set in the river for over an hour without interruption by anyone on a busy stretch of the river on one of the busiest days of the year. Try doing that at Yellowstone or Glacier. I have. It is impossible. Those parks are bumper to bumper traffic all summer long. The ONSR has got it right the way things are now. They are not too crowded.

#### SUMMARY:

Based upon the analysis above I strongly urge the NPS to adopt the No-Action Option. It is clear that Options A-C do not reflect the desires of the majority of users of the ONSR, do not provide substantive improvement or protection of the ONSR, and are not financially viable or sustainable. Options A-C unnecessarily restrict access to and use of the ONSR by the 1.5 million visitors who enjoy it every year and does so at a substantial cost. Rather than adopting the radical restrictions on use proposed in Options A-C I encourage NPS and ONSR to concentrate their efforts within the current strategy by updating it and making logical improvements focused on addressing the minor issues discussed in the proposal.

Finally, LEAVE IT ALONE! The current management strategy provides a tremendously wide range of opportunities for all to enjoy. Anyone can enjoy a quiet hike alone a trail, an ATV ride, sitting on a peaceful gravel bar, camping on a gravel bar, a quiet canoe float without motorboats, a nice motorboat ride, a nice swim, diving off a cliff, a horse trail ride, etc, etc, etc. The ONSR offers all of these opportunities for anyone willing to seek out the parts of the ONSR that currently offer what they are looking for.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide input. I hope my inputs will be carefully considered along with the many other inputs Im sure you will receive. Our public lands are a tremendous resource to this country, Missouri, and the Ozarks. We all want to ensure they are available for enjoyment to the widest public, not locked away so that only a hand full of the elite are able to enjoy them.

Respectfully,  
Phillip and Daniel Callahan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 636    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 14:38:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alternative B .....middle of the road proposal.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 637    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 14:39:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I grew up camping and floating the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The dramatic changes that I have seen over my 40 years are distressing. The streams we floated and swam in are now over crowded with drunks on rafts blasting music that can be heard for miles around, poluted with oil and gas from SUV's and ATV's and private residences and illegal roads that are being blasted into wilderness areas. During the peak seasons it is almost impossible to find a quiet unspoiled piece of river. While Alternative B is a good first step it does not go far enough. Alternative A is the best choice for beginning to bring the park back to what it is supposed to be. Without these protections my kids will never be able to enjoy a park that belongs to all of us not just the few who have no respect for what they are destroying.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 638    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 15:24:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family and I are very grateful to the NPS for the hard work you've put into preparing the management plan for our beloved Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I would like to voice my support for plan A as plan B has the following shortfalls:  
The illegal roads must be closed and the original, natural condition of the area around them needs to be restored;  
This area should be protected from undesignated horse trails and absolutely must prohibit vehicle access to gravel bars.

When our children were little, this was one of the few places we could afford to vacation and camping and floating the ONSR gave us so many wonderful memories. We have one son who grew up to become a professor of environmental ethics and he says that his connection to nature began with those float trips. Unfortunately, as time progressed, we noticed more and more degradation in the ONSR area due to inappropriate use (vehicle and horse



access in particular). We hope that you do everything in your power to bring back the wonderful experiences that our sons enjoyed for future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 639 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 15:56:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am outraged by the proposal to change use age of The Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I am a frequent user of the park and do not appreciate my freedoms being taken away. I want no change at all to the usage.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 640 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 16:03:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO CHANGE! NO CHANGE! NO CHANGE!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 641 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 18:58:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for all the work you have put into the management plans for the Ozark Scenic National Riverways. I have been camping and/or floating on the Current River for at least 50 years, first with my parents, then with my children, camping with my dog, and now with my partner. At the time there was a group campsite across from Pulltite and we always camped there. I remember having cows wander through our campsite once when I was very young. Last summer I was floating with my partner and we were tipped over by the wake of a motorized boat. I long ago quit going to the Current on weekends and I certainly don't want to also give up the weekdays!

The NPS preferred plan, Alternative B, is a good start. But I thought that the river was declared a National Riverway to protect its natural state. And I think that Alternative A will give the river the best chance to recover from the years of abuse it has taken.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 642 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 19:24:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would first like to thank you for your time and efforts in developing this plan, particularly given the multiple and varied stakeholders. Having never been to the Current River I write to you as an individual with plans to take a multiple-day kayak and camping trip later this year on the Current. I was drawn to the Current due factors difficult to find on our waterways: public lands buffering the river for camping and avoidance of the private property issues that limit access and portage, relatively few instream impediments to flow, and opportunities for fishing. However, after further reading about the Current there are several uses that give me pause about visiting this river. The apparent prolific use of motorized boats on the Current is a great detractor from using the river for the noise, safety, and water quality concerns. Further, per the online chat boards belligerent behavior, littering, drunkenness, loud music, and off putting behavior is apparently common on the river. I know to take online comments with a grain of salt, but numerous posts on numerous boards by numerous authors certainly gives me reason for concern. My preference is to see a management plan more reflective of the types of uses, management priorities, and enforcement of regulations found on the Buffalo River. Therefore, I encourage you to consider Option A as the desired scenario. Option B, the NPS preferred option, would also be acceptable as it is considerably more inline with my desires than the status quo. Thank you again for your efforts in preparing this plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 643 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 19:29:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in favor of the plans put forward for the Ozark Riverways. I would like to see an improvement in water quality and preservation of natural and historic points along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. Plan B has many good ideas and management plans. Please implement this plan and protect these resources.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 644 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,08,2014 19:30:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I spent my childhood camping and fishing on the Upper Current. Jet boating to fish for trout above and below Acres Ferry with my dad are memories I cherish and wish to continue with my sons. We also enjoy gigging, boating and camping. We want to see the horsepower limit left alone and want to be able to camp along the river as it is. We want the roads left open so we can camp at the few campsights that are left that my family has camped at for several generations. Thanks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 645 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,08,2014 19:57:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Sedalia Democrat published the alternatives being considered for management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways National Park. I have read the alternatives presented, and I would endorse Alternative A which stresses maintaining the integrity of the park's land and water.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 646 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,08,2014 21:57:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thanks to the National Park service for their thoughtful analysis and plan for protecting our Ozark scenic riverways. Please carefully consider both alternatives and please consider option A as the best plan to protect and preserve our wild places in Missouri. The Jacks Fork river is one of our most beautiful rivers and deserves every consideration to maintain and preserve its natural state to the best of our ability. thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 647 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,09,2014 08:53:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I Sam Peifer dont think there should be any changes above round springs. I use this area for fishing and recreation during the peak months. I have a 25 hp jet i use to take my family up river from round springs. There have been many occasions i have helped canoers and people camping in this area. When canoes have tipped over i have helped retrieve them and there belongings. approximately five years ago my wife and i were fishing on our anniversary above round springs in the afternoon evening hours. There were lots of canoes floating by and we were all having a good time. approximately two hours before dark a gentlemen in his late fourtys and two kids around the age of thirteen to fifteen floated by and the older gentlemen in a canoe by himself. The older gentlemen later had broke his leg and they were screaming for help. The bone was about to break the skin. My wife being in the medical field knew how to help the man as the kids were terribly scared. We got the man on the deck of my boat and hauled him to the round springs lower access. My wife held his leg for an hour and a half while he was in shock. They air evacked him out. My point is if we had not been there who knows what would have happened to the gentleman and kids. I feel the NPS heres all the bad things about the motor boaters. What about all the good things i do as well as many others boaters. Myself and many others from the area have been using this area for recreation for alot of years. Please take this letter into consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 648 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,09,2014 08:57:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a low-impact paddler and camper, I fully support Alternative A. I feel that this would create the lowest impact experience for nature lovers as well as paddlers and campers, while limiting horsepower, etc., on power boats.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 649 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,09,2014 09:19:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

January 9, 2014

Dear Superintendent Black:

Thank you for writing a General Management Plan which offers a variety of options for managing the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. My first trips to the Current River were during the late 1950's with my family and other canoeists from Kansas City. We heard that the Army Corps wanted to dam the Current River, so I am always thankful that didn't happen.

For many years the National Park Service has protected the river and its many cultural and natural features and habitats. But the use of the river has changed since 1964 and there is damage in the floodplain, the riparian corridor and sometimes disturbance and pollution in the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers themselves. There has been overuse of the rivers by a variety of recreationists.

I believe that Alternative B is the best choice for future Ozark National Riverways management. It is a compromise because it does not entirely protect and may not be adequate to protect the waterways and riparian areas from overuse by recreationists. But it does establish non-motorized zones on the upper rivers which will protect some of the river resources and should decrease user conflicts. Many miles of the lower rivers in the park are still open to motorized boats. Alternative B is a compromise between protecting the rivers and riparian areas themselves and offering a variety of recreational uses but Alternative B is also the most practical and economically feasible of the choices.

The 65 miles of social horse trails must be closed especially at unauthorized river crossings but I like the idea of having a horse use and trail management plan with 25 miles of well built horse trails so that sensitive and riparian areas are protected. It sounds like a good idea to offer some horse camping with permits as long as the horse camps don't pollute the waterways.

Keeping ATVs and other motor vehicles off the gravel bars and out of the streams is the single most important action to protect the Current and Jacks Fork. The worse problem overall is sediment getting into the river. Can the National Park Service cooperate with our state StreamTeam program so river users understand why damage to riparian areas, gravel bars and stream beds can ruin the fishing-swimming-the whole river environs? Another issue is that motor noise disturbs all users and wildlife. Consideration must be given so that a family and/or a first time user has an enjoyable visit to the Ozarks National Scenic Riverways.

I camped and hiked at Pulltite campground, Round Spring, Alley Spring and Big Spring as well as hiked other trails when I could find them these last 4 years. I don't find enough trails near the Pulltite campground, Alley Spring and especially at Round Spring. I hope the National Park Service will approve the trail to be build from Round Spring up the Current River to Current River State Park and then down from Round Spring and across the Big Creek watershed to the Ozark Trail.

I would like to see these changes made to improve the hiking trail system:

1. Close roads in primitive zones and replace with hiking trails as stated in Alternative B.
2. Increase and improve signage and improve maintenance of present hiking trails.
3. Produce maps of hiking trails and make readily available.
4. Increase hiking trails in natural zones especially to natural and cultural features.
5. Survey all trails for invasive species and prevent them from getting off trail into forest clearings and pastoral fields as well as into natural and other cultural features.

I camped and hiked at Big Spring in 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013 partly because I love the spring and partly because I enjoy the system of trails there. Since there is a marvelous complex of trails at Big Spring with access to numerous interesting natural features, I believe that park naturalists or volunteers should offer more programs or hikes for park visitors. A number of the trails have easy access points and there are many day hikes which can be offered. But some of the trails are hard to find.

Wilderness Study Area:

I especially enjoyed the large, old pines and oaks along the trail within the Big Spring Pines Natural Area and through the proposed wilderness area. I believe the 3430 acres proposed for wilderness area as in Alternative B will

be the best use of the area for the future. This is an area which can be enjoyed for its natural qualities yet is accessible for learning, training and study more easily than most other wilderness areas. It is truly unique and should have continued protection in its primitive state.

I find the fire tower is a landmark which helps me orient myself from various places throughout the Big Spring complex. To me it is acceptable as a part of the wilderness area although I think the wide road which leads to it is an intrusion. The fire tower has historical and cultural meaning as a way of remembering that through the 1900's Missourians worked hard to eliminate fire throughout the Ozarks. Yet now we use prescribed fire as a tool to bring back plants and flowers that once grew on glades, in fens or in woodlands. Additionally, I hope to find that your use of prescribed fire at Big Spring also helps regenerate pines and oaks. Well managed national park forests with use of planned fire can protect human lives and property from massive wildfires. In that way public lands become a real asset to all of us!

I am not certain that the fire tower will ever be open to the public but it can stand for what we have learned about the use of fire and it can stand for what we hope to learn about forests and woodlands.

I request that the underground utility lines be retired as soon as possible and any acreage allotted to them be allowed to revert to its natural state. The above ground equipment which the company must use to service the line is on the trail through the Big Spring Pines Natural Area and is intrusive. I request it be decommissioned and removed.

Closing of the fire tower road and excluding any vehicles from the Big Pines Natural Area along the ridge trail is important to preserve the character and the health of this area. For instance, care must be taken that any maintenance done on the utility cable doesn't spread invasive plants which may not ordinarily grow in the forest shade but may take hold in forest gaps naturally created when some of the old trees die. Care must be taken that invasive species are not spread along roads and trails. The utility structures above ground do not fit into an otherwise natural and beautiful area and trail.

I enjoy knowing about and seeing the remains of CCC structures where the boys lived as they worked to protect the spring and to build the many structures at Big Spring. While there is much history of the Current River that I don't know, I enjoy the connection to the CCC years. My grandfather and uncle worked for the CCC in eastern Missouri.

Closing:

It would be interesting to know more about Indian use of the rivers and river bottoms. Also, it would be interesting to know more about the families whose names are on tombstones in grave yards in the Current River country.

Please use the best science possible in your plans to protect the riparian area and the rivers. Please protect the native flora and fauna for future generations. It is most important also to work with citizens who live nearby so the springs and waterways won't be polluted from trash, human waste and changes in land use.

Thanks for the chance to comment on the management plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

Betty (Becky) Denney  
MO Streamteam #1546  
6410 Arthur Ave  
St. Louis, MO 63139

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	650	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,09,2014 11:02:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I think by making the proposed changes lively hoods of towns and people will be affected. People depend on the tourism to the Ozarks for jobs and income. The rivers and forest land should be able to be enjoyed by the people. The National Park Service was started to ensure areas like these were continued to be enjoyed by the tourists. The proposed changes will have and drastic and devastating affect on the communities and

people that live in them, as well as on the tourist who enjoy the area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 651    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,09,2014 11:42:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe that the most restrictive option should be selected for management of this area. These river ways belong to all the people in the United States, and should be managed with this in mind. It is wrong for a few who choose to ruin this beautiful area to be allowed to do so simply because they live there and consider it their personal playground.

As our population expands, even under the most restrictive plans, the use will increase. This needs to be kept in mind.

This area is one of the jewels of the state of Missouri. It needs to be preserved and protected for our children and grand children.

Thank you very much.

Marion Mace and Harman Dickerson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 652    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,09,2014 12:31:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a canoe camper and an Ozark Trail backpacker. I have been float camping on the Current River for over 30 years. I have read, with great interest, the 3 proposed alternatives for the new management plan. Although my own personal interests would be best served by Alternative A, that IS NOT the alternative I would choose to support. I find it much too restrictive, and, may I say, "elitist". I believe, very strongly, that National Parks and other public lands should serve a wide multitude of public users, in order to provide strong public support for the protection of public land. We canoers and backpackers are not the only people who pay federal taxes to support these lands (Although I have some friends and acquaintances who seem to act as if they think they are). Of the 3 alternatives, the one I would favor would be C, for I feel that it would provide the greatest service to the greatest number, while still preserving the natural integrity of the Riverways. In fact, I would go further to say that I would favor the "No Action" alternative. I have always felt that the NPS has done a rather good job of balancing diverse public interests at ONSR.

I am particularly disturbed by what I consider to be the extreme restrictions against motorboats in the upper Current and Jack's Fork Rivers, especially those of Alternative A, which would banish them from the Jack's Fork entirely. Ozark people have been using motorized johnboats to fish the rivers long before people started pleasure floating in canoes (and rafts, tubes, and kayaks). They were here first. Should not that tradition be part of the culture that is the ONSR's mission to preserve. I was wondering if it could be possible to suggest an additional variant besides "Peak Season" in zoning the use of motorized craft for fishing... such as... "Time of the Week". Could motorized fishing be allowed Monday through Friday, and prohibited only on the weekends in those "peak season" zones. That would be the best time for fishing anyway.

I would raise the point that when the federal government acquired the rivers for public use, years ago, and displaced a lot of local property owners, it engendered a lot of resentment which is still not forgotten today in the riverways communities. Sometimes that resentment, or even hostility, is directed to people like me - backpackers and canoe floaters - who are seen as outsiders and intruders. I fear that further restricting the use of motorized watercraft will only serve to keep that local resentment alive, as an open sore.

On a more positive note, I very much support the idea, in Alternative C, of placing 2 developed campgrounds at Akers and Blue Spring (JF). These are facilities, I feel, which would serve a great need.

From a personal level, as an Ozark Trail user, I wonder if a modest camping area with fire rings and a privy would be compatible with the zoned use under any of the alternative plans, for the OT crossing of Rocky Creek at Klepzig Mill.

Thank you for this opportunity for input. I look forward to positive changes that I know WILL COME, under whichever alternative should be chosen.

Mark Hodges

---

**Correspondence ID:** 653    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,09,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** First, I want to thank the National Park Service for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis.

Although adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a positive step forward from the status quo, I believe Alternative B could be better, and I therefore recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:

â—Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;  
â—Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings;  
â—Bars all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

My father was born in Shannon County, near Eminence, and although I'm from the Kansas City metro area, I spent every summer growing up on Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. I love those rivers and that country as much as my distant cousins who live in that area; so this is personal. I still canoe those rivers, visit the springs, and hike the trails. I've seen a lot of changes over the years, and I don't like the degradation I'm seeing. ONSR is not nearly as wild and pristine as it once was.

Please adopt Alternative A.  
Thank you.

Heidi Jackson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 654    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,09,2014 20:10:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am Shannon County landowner and have been using the river for over 40 years. I have participated in many different 'river' activities over those years including hunting, fishing, camping, hiking, boating (motorized) and canoeing. As I get older, I feel stronger about protecting the resources in the park. I am happy to see increased horse use controls and elimination of unauthorized access are a part of all the plans. And I agree a bridge at cedar grove is a beneficial addition for visitor access and river integrity.

As I have seen the increase in traffic and development along the river over these past years, I lean more towards Alternative A for purposes of protecting the resource.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 655    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,09,2014 20:59:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alternate A. My family and I frequently visit the Current River. We come to paddle and camp, to enjoy nature and solitude. We refuse to visit Ozark Scenic Riverways from Memorial Day weekend to Labor Day weekend due to the crowds in canoes, motor boats and horse back riders. Alternate A would enhance the visitor's ability to experience nature.

It is difficult to find a gravel bar without tire tracks on it along the Current River. The illegal roads and illegal access points need to be closed for a better visitor experience. We are concerned when we camp on the gravel bars on the Current River that in the middle of the night vehicles will come barreling thru our camp area.

The motor boats zooming along the river dodging canoes and people swimming is a safety concern. Areas without

motors is supported for multiple reasons.

I support management of Big Springs area as wilderness. It would be an important addition to the Wilderness Areas of Missouri. The wilderness area would be a draw to the area and increase tourist revenues by hikers and hunters.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 656 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,09,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you, National Park Service, for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. I believe adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo.

However, both the Missouri Sierra Club and my family believe Alternative B could be better. We recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:

â—‹ Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;

â—‹ Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings;

â—‹ Bars all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

Thank you very much for considering my comments. I hope you will adopt Alternative A and preserve these beautiful areas.

Sincerely,

Dr. Robin Rysavy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 657 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,09,2014 22:42:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My preference would be Alternative A

---

**Correspondence ID:** 658 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,10,2014 00:14:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to urge the NPS to use the No-Action alternative for the General Management Plan. I believe there are sufficient laws and restrictions in place already that provide adequate protection for the ONSR. I have lived here all of my life and have not seen any negative effects on our rivers requiring further restrictions on use by the public.

I would guess that there are approximately three or four months of the year when the tourist season brings a fairly large number of visitors to ONSR. I would be interested to know how the NPS arrives at the numbers of visitors each year. I believe that for eight or nine months out of the year it is primarily, not all, but primarily, local area residents who use the rivers and adjacent land. I do not believe we who live here all twelve months of the year should have to be so restricted in our use of the rivers and lands because of a three or four month very busy period of time.

It is hard for me to express my feelings of just how much I love the beauty of this area and how moved I am, the happiness I feel when I see, for instance, the snow at Big Spring and along the river. I, like more local people around here, are not young people anymore and if you try and make it possible for me to be able to use the river only by a canoe then that will not be possible for me. I believe it would be, at the very least, unfair to people like me to not be able to travel up and down the river by boat. I do not believe it is what was ever intended to happen when the Riverways act was passed.

We do want the rivers and lands protected because we love them and want them to be enjoyed by future generations of our families and friends but not to the exclusion of people being able to use them as we always have. There is a long history of activities like gigging that have been enjoyed for many years by people including my family and I know the NPS, Riverways take an interest in honoring and documenting the history of the rivers and that is a part of it, as well as camping.

I will close my comments about the plan by again asking you to please go with the No-Action alternative.

I am NOT in favor of Wilderness designation for the 3,430 acres near Big Spring. In the newspaper article published

in the Dec. 5, 2013, Current Local, Van Buren, MO, it states that "Public use of the area would remain unchanged from current management conditions.". It seems to be sufficiently maintained without requiring wilderness designation.  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 659    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,10,2014 07:36:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

WITH ALL DUE RESPECT:

Upon the reading of the changes that are about to made, probably without any concern of those impacted by the changes that will probably be shoved down our throats.

I can't help but wonder what my "LORD" and "SAVIOR" thinks on these changes, that are about to be mandated, a river system he gave man to use and to preserve by all means without serious compromise from those who wish to shut down all use because of their beliefs. Their seems to be a growing movement of these stereotypes in our nation, creating confusion and hatred throughout this great nation "GOD" gave us to use and preserve.

My first visit to current river in 61' was a campout @ the John Grubbs property , GRUBBS' was the beginning of my love for this "GREAT RIVER SYSTEM".

Every spring and fall, my wife and I spend one week of total relaxation, camping @ Big Springs Park. Smallmouth & walleye fishing, floating down the river is a bonus!

But upon reading these changes, it will eliminate the use of my boat which has a 175 hp outboard. Allow me to rattle your brain, the outboard I utilize is a evinrude e-tec ,the industries most compliant motor made, best fuel economy and the leader in the least emissions of any outboard used in the Scenic Riverways, have your board to investigate this claim, but yet it will be prohibited!

Please reconsider this issue, the greatest problem I see on the system is the canoes, rafts, tubes,leaving all their trash behind,severe drunkenness, dope smokers, and most of these people come from urban areas (St. Louis), but yet it seems , the urban people are in favor of the changes that are about to be made. "WHAT A SHAME". I've NEVER HAD A PROBLEM WITH FELLOW FISHERMAN, I REPECT EVERYONES PRIVACY, BUT LET THE TRUTH FALL WHERE IT BELONGS!

Please don't let the anti groups sway the Park Service into making such a rash decision, that will only impact the local people who were reared on this system,I being among the elite!

I pray you reconsider your plan, throw it in the trash, because that is exactly what it is!!!!!!!

DUE RESPECT,  
DOYLE L.ABBEY

---

**Correspondence ID:** 660    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,10,2014 10:14:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** One of the most wonderful beautiful things our state has to offer is ONSR. In this day and age of electronics we find it hard to get the younger generation involved in the outdoors. To sit here and read a document that is geared towards limiting one of the most unique outdoor resouces we have to the point of being anything remotely easy to access and enjoy is ridiculous. I find it as something the NPS should not be supporting. As I read it I find myself wondering if the NPS really just wants to get rid of the public. Instead of limiting and cutting back on the area of the park available for use shoudl NPS not instead be fnding ways to increase use of the park? Looking for ways to draw familes and indivuals in to the park, not making it more difficult. The improvements need to be made for recreation not to kick recreation out. People need to be educated on how to properly care for the river and habitat.Kicking people out is not education. Turning people away is not education or preservation. Teaching people and giving them more areas for recreation is the way. We use ONSR for many uses each year. You will find our family in canoes floating the rivers, swimming, hiking it many trails and horseback. WeWe travel six hours round trip to visit the area from the beginning of March until Thanksgiving. We are avid users. While I know that no change is not an option, the drastic changes being called for are unrealistic to keeping this area appealing to its users. Be it those that are regulars or those that come a couple times are year to first timers. WE travel to many other national parks: Rocky Mountain, Shawnee, Grand Teton, Smoky Mountain, etc. None of these parks have a permit system, granted some used to but they no longer do. Why hassle your patrons with such requirments? Missouri was recently distinguished as the "Trails" state. We also are one of the leading states in the



nation when it comes to horse population. One would think that the NPS would be interested in growing and devolving those 2 things together. That NPS would want to promote more riding and recreation use such as camping in its parks. Instead of turning these people away with permit requirements. I find it disheartening that a service that was developed to help promote recreation and being outdoors and education is turning itself into a department of regulation. For turning people off of our national parks and outdoors. There are a 3 weekends a year that the area has a lot of visitors, so those 3 weekends are going to be allowed to dictate what happens the other 49 weekends of the year? There are things the park service can do as in making water crossings safer, less erosion in those areas as well, we have seen things they have done in other states, without limiting the amount of people allowed to enjoy the rivers and surrounding area. Instead of forcing more regulation why doesn't the park service offer more resources to the users over a wider area? Instead of concentrating everyone together. Why not put in some rest areas along the river to give river folks a place to pull over to use the restroom instead of the river to help with the e.coli. Vaulted toilets would go a long way for all users. More resources over a wider area are needed not less in a more concentrated area. How is that better for the environment and the recreationist? There are things in the plan that can be implemented but on a smaller basis. Is it really necessary to get rid of so many trails and roads? Obviously there are people coming to the area warranting a need for those things, by taking them away you are turning people away. There are things that can be done to help preserve the river for everyone's use. Limiting it to where it is more of a pain to enjoy is not what it was for. Getting out with nature means getting out, not being forced with all users into a small area. Recreation while educating people on preservation is the way. More education on leaving no trace, steeper fines for litter, etc are needed not kicking people out of areas. It is like NPS wants to put everyone in one area to better patrol them. The park is for the American citizens to enjoy not be harassed out of.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 661    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,10,2014 10:23:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have spent many nights reading over the plan. While no change is only in there because by law it has to be it is the closest to the best option based on what the other options are. While change is something that will always happen it doesn't have to be as drastic as what NPS is proposing. More education is needed in getting with people on taking care of the area. So many businesses will be hurt by your proposal. So many people will be turned away from coming to the area. Having permits for riders is ridiculous. So many other states have gotten rid of bridle tags and here NPS wants to bring it to Missouri. What once you have turned off all the riders to the area and the damage is done to business then it will be dropped? Same as has happened in other states. More resources are needed in this area to accommodate users. The answer is not limiting the area to be used it is growing the accommodations to meet the needs of the users. More campgrounds for special interests, more vaulted toilets, etc.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 662    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,10,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** First, I wish to thank the National Park Service for putting forth a very good and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a huge positive step forward from the present.

However, Alternative B does not go far enough. I would strongly recommend the adoption of Alternative A since it provides additional needed protections for the rivers.

Most importantly, Alternative A closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads. It also closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings. Finally, it bars vehicle access to gravel bars. All of these actions would prevent further degradation of both the rivers and the riparian areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 663    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,10,2014 11:39:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** do not cave from the pressure of the liberal sierra club freak show!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 664    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,10,2014 13:59:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Park Supervisor,

Please protect and preserve the Ozark National Scenic Riverways from degradation by unauthorized ATVs, horses, and motorboats. They are more than a local playground, they are a National Resource that cannot be duplicated or replaced. They should retain a high quality natural character for hundreds of years and many future generations of US citizens and international visitors alike.

I have greatly enjoyed taking my private canoe to the float the rivers dozens of times each year for 25 years. It is healthy to be in nature, to watch the clear spring waters, listen to migratory warblers and ducks, study the plants and aquatic wildlife, and to listen in a motor-free environment. I practice "leave no trace", respect the land and other people. I do all I can to support MDC and other conservation organizations to preserve our natural resources.

More and more I am shocked at the over-use of the rivers by fast motor boats that make wake on the river banks, large parties of trail riders whose horses defecate in the river and erode the land, ATVs that tear up the gravel bars, and nudity and extreme drunkenness by canoeists. There seems to be little regard for regulations.

Recently, I was e-mailed a video made by local men of the Ozark area. It made a poor argument that the local people should direct the use of the river and not be influenced by "ignorant" urban outsiders that did not know anything about the river. This video included promoting a commercial tour guide motoring into Pulltite Spring and Cave Spring on the Current River.

Here is a link to that video. It includes names. <http://ozarkareanetwork.com/localnews/?p=28661>

I know you are relatively new to this position. I hope that you will see the job as a National responsibility to protect the resources under your care, more than to be pressured by local users only. Your decision will have a permanent effect on these amazing rivers.

Respectfully yours,

Barbara Van Vleck

---

**Correspondence ID:** 665 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,10,2014 16:39:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the NPS-preferred Alternative B. I disagree with those who think that those who live outside the area shouldn't have any voice in the management of ONSR. The national significance of the area was recognized with the enabling legislation which established this first protection of a river system in the United States. If direction to management is left totally to those with economic or pure recreation interests, the resources will be further degraded.

Those uses which threaten the world class resources of the area, particularly the aquifers and cave systems, as well as the water quality of the rivers, must be mitigated. There are far too many ATV trails, campsites and river access roads that have been developed by illegal use. This somehow needs to be addressed. Enforcement is not the total answer. Some effort and funds needs to be toward obliteration, etc. I'm not sure another Roads and Trail planning document with public input will be effective. This GNP should give adequate direction to take the necessary action.

Another issue which needs to be addressed, is the numbers of users on the rivers: both tubers and canoeists. In some cases the rivers have become so crowded with people, the total visitor experience is negatively impacted.

I hope that the horses involved in the Trail Ride at Eminence is better controlled. The levels of e. coli in the river used to reach dangerous levels in past years.

Vehicles on gravel bars should only be allowed in very limited and designated places. Vehicles should never be allowed in the rivers except at a designated ford. The same with horses. I agree with limiting crossings.

I'm not sure about additional campsites being added. Maybe to better delineate some that are already being used. Also, where are horse trails being added? Is this necessary?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 666    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,11,2014 07:21:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I want to state for the record the "NO ACTION " plan is what is best for the Current river basin area that Is included in the National Park Service plan.

To address some of my concerns regarding the different areas of problems that the NPS says needs to be changed..

Why is it that Wild horses make their own trails and if recreations horse back riders come across horse trails made by these wild horse and use them to ride on .... Why or how would stopping recreational horse backriding make any impact on our rivers and the land around it ?? Wild horses have and will continue to use NPS land and they make NO impact on land ...

Second As a retired Water Patrolman , I know the problems and continuing issues with the NPS and their Park Rangers. They do NOTHING ...regarding law enforcement. THEY MAKE NO ARRESTS , unless someone has parked on the grass , or have gotten off some roadway in an open field , Run people off camping areas or gravel bars where people have camped for hundreds of years.. It seems they want to do things that only drive the local people away from building a good relationship with themselves and the NPS

As a law enforcement officer I remember working in different locations on the river ways on planned enforcement actions for drugs and alcohol situations..

Only to have the NPS Rangers tell us the couldn't write tickets or make arrests.. They would only assist with transport or observation to promote the arrest of violators...

This mindset has continued even today with practically no law enforcement action taken on the biggest problem on the river ways ...The litter, nudity , drug and under age alcohol abuse, assaults rapes all have continued to get worse with no one to address these issues except the occasional participation from the Mo. Highway Patrol .

They do address all of these issues and make arrests .What is a mystery for me is What exactly do Rangers do ?? Taking a look at their arrests , complaint calls , and evidence of their daily activity should show why we need them as law enforcement officers.. They are paid by the people and should be seen making arrests and keeping things in check on the rivers . Why is it when someone drowns they don't make recovery of the victims ?? Why do they not work or check boats for intoxicated operators ? why don't they patrol campgrounds in the NPS areas ?? Someone will soon request for the past 5yrs of arrest and complaint records from the NPS on the rangers in the Current river jacks fork area ..

WHAT DO PARK RANGERS DO ALL DAY ?? I think lots of these issues regarding the Gen Man Plan could me headed off if Rangers were REAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS and work to make NPS a safe family place to go for all .

My thought is The NPS rangers are NOT law enforcement officers and don't conduct themselves in a manner to stop any of these issues.. To prove these comments , IM sure the arrests for the last five or six years or more can be obtained though proper channels ..

Stopping local people from using the riverways, closing horse trails, shutting down river access, and stopping boat use on the upper end of the river due to someone from Colorado or some other far away place ,who never has visited or used the river is a complete injustice to people. I have one more comment and that is how people will know if these Comments are actually being counted correctly ?? or even considered ??? Is there someway each one of the comments can me verified to make sure everyone is being heard ?? What would keep this comment I just wrote to just be deleted and not counted ??

Im thinking due to the way this is being done, I have to depend on someone from the NPS to be fair and honest to hear not only my comments but hundreds of others .... Government trust is something at this point something most of the general population DOES NOT TRUST ...

NO ACTION IS THE ONLY ACTION TO TAKE.....

---

**Correspondence ID:** 667 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,11,2014 10:53:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think option b is the best solution for canners, campers, hikers and the tourism economy of the region. And will also and most importantly preserve the resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 668 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,11,2014 15:14:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The NPS proposal for the Ozark Scenic Riverways is a much needed proposal which I heartily support. I have been a "river rat" in years past, organizing float trips with friends, and have stopped doing so because of bad experiences having to contend with noise and intrusion from ATVs and motorboats, which I feel have no place in a protected area. It's bad enough having your natural experience ruined by the noise, but the effect on the environment is really bad. My husband and I both go to places like the Current River and Jacks Fork to enjoy nature, and we hope that the NPS Management Plan will succeed and return this area to the one we remember from years past.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 669 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,11,2014 16:51:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I do not want any change on the ONSR management plan. My grandmother was born down there and my family has been going there for years.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 670 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,12,2014 08:38:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

In the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan/Wilderness Study/EIS, you have an opportunity to improve the management of a unique and valuable area that will provide enduring resources for future generations of visitors. Some obvious benefits to the NPS and the citizens it serves could include increased revenue from tourism, increased educational opportunities, and improved habitat for game and non-game animal species. Another great result of improved management of this area could include the recognition of this area as an exceptional example and precedent for future management revisions.

I recognize that each of the various action alternatives would benefit certain groups of potential users and constrain others. As an avid hiker, fly fisherman, canoer, and camper, I realize the benefits of improved access and facilities. At the same time, I also appreciate the benefits presented by wilderness areas that offer few or no improved facilities. Before moving to Missouri, I have spent my life living in Michigan, Montana, and Alaska. In each of these states, I was lucky to enjoy their vast and wild spaces. I speak for myself, my friends, and my family when I state that we would all truly love to have wild and unimproved areas to enjoy in Missouri.

I appreciate your request for public comments, and thank you for considering mine. I support Alternative A as described in the Draft General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 671 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo.

Nevertheless I believe Alternative B could be better. The Missouri Sierra Club recommends the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:  
â— Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;

â—‹ Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings;  
â—‹ Bars all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

Let's take advantage of this opportunity. Let's not break the promise we made to future generations when the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers were designated America's first National Scenic Riverways in 1964.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 672    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,12,2014 13:30:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There is no way to "improve" the wilderness areas left in the United States. I ask anyone who doesn't agree to find a natural place here in Missouri and look at it differently. By becoming aware of the "space" in your vista as well as the things seen as objects, I believe you will understand why some people believe that the natural world is divine.

In my youth my family spent time every summer on the Current River, at Owl's Bend, and I know that places like these, as this one was then, carve a deep place in us where we can relate not only with the world around us but with one another with compassion. Noticing the space in the world brings us closer to reality.

Getting rid of such places for another purpose is like replacing ourselves with robots. From the bottom of my heart I ask you to protect our divine areas for those of us now and those in the future, because they are crucial to our humanity.

Gerald W. Landrum  
St. Louis, MO 63104

---

**Correspondence ID:** 673    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** â—‹ Thank the National Park Service for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo.  
â—‹ Nevertheless the Missouri Sierra Club believes Alternative B does not go far enough. We recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:  
â—‹ Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;  
â—‹ Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings;  
â—‹ Bars vehicle access to gravel bars.

I concur with the statements above.  
Patricia Mort

---

**Correspondence ID:** 674    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,12,2014 21:55:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** January 12, 2014

To: United States National Park Service

From Tom and Helen Sager, 8 Laird Ave. Rolla, MO 65401

Comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan

Dear Sir or Madam:

Thank you for your fine research and your excellent detailed document, "Draft General Management Plan / Wilderness Study / Environmental Impact Statement Ozark National Scenic Riverways".

Our country's scenic treasures must be preserved. Ozark National Scenic Riverways is one of our greatest treasures.

Sadly, they have been degraded through overuse and inappropriate use. It is past time to restore these riverways to a pristine condition so we can enjoy them now and for many generations to come.

It is time to close illegal roads and restore them to a natural condition..

It is time to limit motorized access to the riverways.

It is time to limit overuse by horses.

It is time to limit over-commercialization.

It is time to bring to justice those individuals, businesses and government entities that continue to degrade our riverways through illegal use. They should not be rewarded for their past bad behavior.

While the preferred alternative "B" would be a step in the right direction, it does not go far enough. Only Alternative "A" can provide ONSR the protection it needs to recover from years of misuse.

Yours sincerely,

Tom and Helen Sager

---

**Correspondence ID:** 675    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,13,2014 06:31:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The equine community that visits our Ozark Riverways is larger than you would suspect. Closing these trails and not allowing river crossings would kill the small communities that thrive on this out of town and out of state business. Reconsider your proposal!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 676    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,13,2014 08:20:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Ozarks in Missouri are a mecca for horse riders. Please do not eliminate any trails or water crossings. Horsemen spend a small fortune in Missouri to take advantage of the beautiful trails. If you make the area less desirable for riders you will dramatically reduce the income of a great many Missouri residents. Please - keep things they way they are or increase the horse trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 677    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,13,2014 10:47:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir or Madame:

I must first render my most sincere gratitude for a thorough study on a precious resource here in south central Missouri as well as in the entire United States. While not as breathtaking as the Grand Canyon, the beaches of California, or the mountains of Colorado, the Scenic Rivers of the Ozarks are a unique ecological, recreational, and beautiful area of our country.

I do not support any plan that does not take into account all evidence available. The study was exhaustive and complete.

If a new plan must be implemented, I agree with the NPS preferred plan B. While it may be a bit more restrictive for some users, it is the most responsible and equitable for the use and protection of the area.

However, I have some concern about the use of 'climate change' as a creditable metric for decision making. I am thankful that "climate change" was not a determining factor in an otherwise well crafted product.

Sincerely:

---

**Correspondence ID:** 678 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,13,2014 11:46:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello, I would like to make a comment regarding the plans for the Scenic Riverways. I use many of the rivers in the Ozarks for kayaking and hiking and I find that I truly appreciate the beauty here. I would like for the Park Service to implement the alternative A plan for several reasons, mostly to keep all vehicles off the gravel bars and from keeping ATV's from travelling across rivers. Please keep all illegal roads closed and horses off of undesignated trails. Thank you, Corliss Schaeffer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 679 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,13,2014 12:29:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I totally vote for plan A. We need to protect this precious waterway. My family goes there every summer, and I am definitely noticing the effects of too may horses, motorized vehicles, illegal building. I see the ground that has been plowed to make roads for these motorized vehicles and it are so ugly, and polluted, and bare. When we canoe in the water it is so peaceful and then all of a sudden a motorboat dashes by and the kids are in danger, the oil from the boats are making their marks, and the peaceful canoe trip is destroyed. The horses poop is destroying the pureness of the water..way to many horses.  
I come from Los Angeles originally and watched the polluting of the ocean where it is now too dirty to swim. When I discovered these waterways I was so very pleased to haver a clean waterway where we could vacation safely. My children come back to Missouri every summer to canoe on the Current and the Jack's Fork.I beg you to please pass plan A so we Missourians (and other persons also) can continue to enjoy a wonderful resource that is currently in danger.  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 680 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,13,2014 13:09:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to make a comment on the Draft Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I strongly recommend Alternative A because it limits excessive horse traffic, which truly degrades our beautiful rivers. I use the rivers widely and I also insist on protecting them from the ATVs on the gravel bars. Thank you, George Schaeffer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 681 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,13,2014 15:05:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** January 8, 2014

To whom it may concern,

I have been fortunate to explore a number our nation's finest national parks and forest service wilderness areas. Yellowstone, Acadia, Grand Teton, the Smoky Mountains, the Wind Rivers in Wyoming, and the San Juans in Colorado are some of the magnificent places that I've experienced alone and in the company of others.

While a walk along the Current or a float down the Jacks Fork will not include a panorama of alpine peaks or a sunrise over the Atlantic, close inspection reveals beauty no less sublime. Water, transparent as air, dances down riffles and into the aquamarine depths along an ancient bluff line. Delicate fronds of ferns cascade from a shady alcove, while just across the river, the bold blossoms of prairie dock glow in defiance of the scorching sun. People I've taken here, people with whom I have stood atop the Continental Divide deep in the heart of Wyoming, are as moved by subtleties of Blue Spring as they are by impossible heights of the Rockies. The rivers, as you know, are a national treasure.

Yet, we allow this treasure to be diminished. Quiet enjoyment is displaced by the almost constant drone of jet-boats.

The woods, the fields, the gravel bars, and the river itself are all scarred with ATV tracks. There are no jet-boats screaming up and down the Snake River at the base of the Tetons and no fleet of ATVs tearing up any beach at Acadia. Float the Current or Jacks Fork and you'll see this in spades.

Just this past spring, my wife, my two young sons, and I rounded a bend near Lewis Hollow below Akers only to be greeted by gunfire on one side of the river and a schoolbus, two RVs, and five other vehicles on the opposite gravel bar. Years ago, there was no road to this spot. Now there is a 10 foot wide, eroded gash through the forest, all the way to the river. There are frequently RVs parked along the river bank at Twin Rocks. An old forest track at the "jumping rock" above Pulltite now serves as a full blown jet-boat launch site. And the list goes on. The river is commandeered by the few to the detriment not only of the many who come to experience the rivers as they were meant to be, but to the obvious detriment of the rivers themselves. We permit abuses in the Riverways that would not be countenanced in any vaguely comparable location. There is no excuse for this.

It is for these reasons that I write in strong support of most of the Park Service's draft management plan. The Park Service's preferred alternative forges a workable compromise among the competing demands on the rivers. If the rivers are to remain relatively pristine in perpetuity, you simply cannot permit the continued proliferation of unauthorized roads along the rivers. The Park Service's preferred alternative addresses this issue.

The preferred alternative falls short, however, of adequately addressing the use of jet-boats, particularly on the Current River between Round Spring and Two Rivers. This stretch, along with the upper Jacks Fork, represents perhaps the finest stretch of float stream in the state. If motorized boats are to be permitted for the sake of motorized access, such access can be achieved, as it is on the Buffalo River, by boats equipped with low horsepower motors. Some say that further limits will end a long-standing tradition of jon-boating the rivers. This is absurd. The famed wooden jon-boats of the Ozark rivers were never equipped with modern jets that allowed them to virtually fly up and down the river. Instead, the only discernible reason for allowing jet-boats or any other high powered motorized vessel on this stretch of the river is to satisfy the demands of a miniscule minority of river users who desire not only access, but access via a high speed joyride. Limiting the use of jet-boats above Two Rivers is no more a limitation on access than requiring people to walk down the sidewalk rather than drive. The Riverways were not set aside to ensure some imaginary "right" to an aquatic superhighway; but on most days from May through September, that is precisely what it has become.

Throughout this process, the park service has gathered and received loads of data demonstrating the exponential increase of motorized use in and along the rivers. Those who dispute these facts rely on hyperbole rather than reality. This is because the increase in motorized use is an irrefutable fact and demonstrates conclusively the need for reasonable limits on motorized use.

There is, however, a more fundamental issue than the facts and data demonstrating the wisdom of reasonable limits, and it is this: in the long run, it is our shared experience of the rivers that will dictate how we choose to treat the rivers. The decision you face is not one that can be made solely on the basis of numerical reduction. To do so would relegate the rivers to the status of a mathematical abstraction; a set of extrapolated data, a point on a graph, a simple resource to be used according to popular whim.

To make the wisest decision, you must account for not only the numbers, but the reason why so much time and toil has been expended on gathering those numbers. The reason is the rivers themselves and the unique, increasingly scarce opportunity they provide for potentially world class outdoor experience. The legislation establishing the Riverways recognized these values and must be re-affirmed. When the rivers become, as they have in many places on many days, nothing but an outdoor amusement park, people come to see them and treat them as such. One need not spend much time on the rivers to see this. If this continues, the time is not far off when most people have no recollection of a peaceful day on the river; no deep, personal conviction that the rivers are a treasure at all. If that happens, degradation will continue and the Riverways will become a national park in name only.

There is an easy way to avoid this. Adopt the preferred alternative, with a slight modification to limit the use of jet-boats and other motorized vessels to areas below Two Rivers. There are hundreds of thousands of acres of reservoirs in the Ozarks that are open to power-boating. There are hundreds of miles of Ozark rivers to run jet-boats as one sees fit. Conversely, there are precious few miles set aside for the overwhelming majority who seek a quieter experience. Please, take this opportunity to do what is right both for the rivers and the vast majority of river users.



Limit the use of jet-boats above Two Rivers.

Sincerely,

Eric S. Peterson  
St. Louis, Missouri

---

**Correspondence ID:** 682    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,13,2014 15:57:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I cannot attend the meeting but would like to vote for Alternative A endorsed by the Sierra Club.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 683    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,13,2014 17:15:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** i am a member of the Missouri Streamteam volunteer organization. there are now over 5,000 such teams in our state whose members volunteer time and effort to help keep our streams healthy and clean. we are passionate about our streams, and there are a lot of us. my feelings regarding the national scenic riverways aren't completely well-informed ones, i admit. in essence, i and many others who care deeply about the special waters in our state want to see them protected and kept from further degradation. the small canoe-able streams must be kept safe from internal combustion engines of all kinds. 4-wheelers have no place anywhere near them. there are more than adequate places for people who enjoy off-roading to do so without having to damage our streams. i feel that these areas are so rare and so vulnerable that they will be loved to death without enforced restrictions. like people in many backward areas of the country, those who have a family history in the southern areas of Missouri tend to resent outside interference, especially if that interference changes "the way things have always been around here". compromise is unavoidable; but, in all negotiations, the streams and surrounding areas come first.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 684    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,13,2014 18:04:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a member of the Friends of Ozark Riverways(FOR), the Missouri Parks Association and the Sierra Club I agree with FOR's recommendation that agrees with NPS that alternative B provides the most balance among the 3 alternatives. I also believe the plan could be strengthened by dealing with scenic easement violations; designating 3430 acres for wilderness management; zoning for horsepower limits and motorized free zones; increasing hiking trails more than is planned; no new horse camp inside the park and methods to significantly reduce horse impacts, including permitting; natural and cultural resource management as outlined by FOR; riverbank issues should be managed with natural solutions and any development have low impact; prioritize solutions for problem areas that does not included more hardened development, but rather - restoration; and finally I support park management that manages it as a national resource focused on long-term stewardship that protects these resources in an unimpaired condition for the public benefit of recreation, education, and scientific value.

I and my family use and appreciate this valuable natural resource as a floater, camper and hiker throughout each year.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 685    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,13,2014 18:24:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I feel that no change is in order. All of the proposals are too restrictive and there is a great loss of trail. The horseback riders would suffer quite a loss of some good trail with these proposals. I feel that lands can be manged well without turning them into Wilderness areas which are too restrictive in my opinion.  
Thank you for taking public input in this matter.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 686 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,13,2014 19:36:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am totally in support of the proposed management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 687 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,13,2014 19:42:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have went on multiple camping and floating trips on, and around, the Current River. They have all been really memorable experiences. In particular the natural beauty of that area of the Ozarks really impressed me. I especially enjoyed hiking around the river, and fishing in it.  
After reading the management plans I really think Alternative A is most appealing. To me, one of the best things about the Current River is that many stretches of it have a very natural appearance. It gives you the feeling that you are somewhere relatively untouched by modern development. I believe a lot of people share this same sentiment with me. I am sure many of the people I have traveled with to the Current River do. I am encouraged that your recommended plan seeks to end the continued use of un-designated horse trails and crossings, but I think it is also important to limit peoples camping access by vehicle onto gravel bars. I think this should be limited because people really tend to turn any area near the gravel bars into a parking lot. They forge their own "roads" down to the river. This is just unnecessary and no doubt contributes to increased erosion in those areas of the stream bank where peoples vehicles have driven over them repeatedly.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 688 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,13,2014 21:01:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is a beautiful, well known area that needs protection. People from all over Missouri and other states come to enjoy the beauty and get away from "city life". Please do all you can to ensure the preservation of one of Missouri's spectacular natural areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 689 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,14,2014 00:20:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the NPS alternative B. It is a balanced approach which will improve the Enviornment in the area while supporting visitation benefiting our region.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 690 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,14,2014 06:02:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the General management Plan (GMP), our river ways have been an important part of our tourist economy. Please continue to let the National Parks service take care of our river ways. The state of Missouri does not have the means to do this and will not support it the way it should.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 691 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,14,2014 07:21:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please adopt the plans and principles advocated by the Friends of Ozark Riverways, to best preserve this unique wilderness heritage for our children.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 692 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,14,2014 07:23:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Greetings- -

---

Just a short note to say that my family (from Kansas) has enjoyed visiting the magical environment of the Current River for many years and hope to do so many more into the future. We spent upwards of a week in MO every year and certainly appreciate the many precious differences it has to offer compared to our prairie home state. Long may this jewel (and all of God's creatures) in it be protected by the federal government!

Best wishes,

Dave & Ann Redmon

Manhattan, KS

---

**Correspondence ID:** 693    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,14,2014 07:32:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I fully support the NPS plan for Ozark National Scenic Waterways

---

**Correspondence ID:** 694    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,14,2014 07:39:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't let the state take control of this situation as they are idiots in Jefferson City. They cannot make good decisions about minor issues much less our waterways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 695    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,14,2014 08:45:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been a regular visitor to the Eleven Point River for the past 15 years and make 5-6 multi-day trips a year to the Eleven Point River area. I hope that the Eleven Point River will be included in any type of management plan for the future.

I have camped on the river gravel bars many times, although as I have gotten older, my group of friends and myself mostly rent cabins from local owners in the area now. In the 15 years of going to the Eleven Point River, I have seen a big increase in the number of people that use the river. While 15 years ago, a float trip on the Eleven Point River would be an experience with much solitude and a quiet, peaceful nature experience, it seems that it is a very rare day indeed that one can capture the quiet peaceful experience in nature on this river. My biggest complaint is I have seen a tremendous increase in the number of jetboats on the river. While some jet boat owners are respectful and courteous on the river, the vast majority fly up and down the river with no regard for others, especially those in a canoe. Numerous times I have witnessed a family with small children get turned over in a canoe by the wakes from an inconsiderate person operating a jet boat that flies by with no regard for others on the river. THIS IS A COMMON OCCURENCE, NOT A RARE EVENT.

I am in favor of eliminating all jet boats on the stretch of river that is part of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. There is plenty of river downstream for people to enjoy the jet boats. There should be a stretch of river that visitors can expect to have a quiet, peaceful experience of floating and camping out on a gravel bar without the constant disruption of jet boats racing by.

I have no problem with small prop boats of horsepower or less that make very little noise, very little wakes, and do very little damage to shorelines.

I have also seen an increase of unauthorized access points on the river and ATV paths. Law enforcement should and must put an end to this illegal trespassing.

I will say this - it is my expectation and the expectation of others who feel the same way that I do, that NOTHING will be done about the rampant abuse of jet boats on the Current and Eleven Point Rivers because there are now too many LOCAL jet boat owners and the legislators in that part of the state will never make a decision to protect the streams and the peaceful experience that some of us want because no legislator is going to risk VOTES to do the right thing.

In closing, the Eleven Point River, Current River, and Jacks Fork River are truly natural gems in Missouri. Long ago, our predecessors made a decision to protect these natural resources for future generations to enjoy. I am afraid that now our legislators and natural resource overseers have lost the GUTS to DO THE RIGHT THING AND PROTECT THESE RESOURCES.

Please consider making the necessary decisions to return these areas to what our predecessors intended them to be for future generations.

Mark Vogt, Ste. Genevieve, Missouri

---

**Correspondence ID:** 696 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,14,2014 10:46:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I enjoyed a wonderful weekend with my son canoeing the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers in Missouri a few years ago. While seeing bald eagles, otters, and deer was great the damage and disturbances caused by excessive horse and other traffic detracted from the "wild and scenic" experience. I therefore urge the NPS to adopt Alternative A to maintain this national resource in a more natural state, so that current and future generations can also enjoy the pristine beauty.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 697 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,14,2014 11:15:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in strong support of the Park Service's draft management plan to limit the use of large engine powered boats on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. I am also in support of protecting the unique riverbanks and gravel bars from the harmful erosion caused by vehicles that barrel through the woods to gain access to remote spots on the rivers.

You will no doubt note that I am what they call an interloper. I live in New Hampshire where we (like you) have a proud tradition of enjoying the great outdoors, so why should my views on the management of natural resources so far away be considered at all?

Before I answer this question a bit about me. I went to school in St. Louis and learned to love the Ozarks. I have been on many a float trip over the years and have been saddened each time I hear another engine angrily buzzing on the river like a giant mechanical mosquito. My last trip was this past summer to celebrate my 40th birthday. I brought my wife and we joined two dear friends who are Missouri natives for a wonderful three day float. The reason I keep coming back is I enjoy the unique natural beauty and tranquility that can be achieved by a relatively short drive from St. Louis. I have often thought that the Ozarks rival the White Mountains (and others) when it comes to getting away from the hustle and bustle of every day life. It is a place to enjoy the natural beauty of the world and to recharge my spiritual batteries.

So why should my thoughts be considered? Over the years I have made several trips to your great state for the sole purpose of floating these rivers. I have brought different friends with me from time to time so they could enjoy the experience as well and I have never had a friend who did not rave about it afterwards. In short, I have brought my out of state dollars half way across the country to spend in your restaurants, your stores, and your canoe rental businesses (I have used them all from Two Rivers to Carrs) solely for the purpose of enjoying the beauty of these rivers. When I was in school, back in the mid-90s, I noticed far less motor/jet boats angrily buzzing up and down your rivers and I notice far less trucks lurking on their banks. As the years passed I have continued to take vacations in Missouri for the purpose of floating, but my enjoyment and its draw (at least for me) has decreased as I have felt less and less like I am getting away from it all when I am faced with these machines pushing my little canoe out of the way or leaving us to navigate their wakes. I have seen more and more gashes in the hills caused by trucks and I have had a harder and harder time hearing the pleasant noises of the birds and insects over blaring radios.

I hope you follow through with your thoughtful plan to protect this natural treasure. I promise if you do, I will continue to make trips to enjoy them in a respectful way.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Cohen  
Concord, New Hampshire

---

**Correspondence ID:** 698    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,14,2014 11:19:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Jetboats should be banned inside the Ozark National Scenic Riverway. If any motorized water craft are allowed at all, they should be limited to 10 HP the same as on the Buffalo River in Arkansas.

All illegal roads, ATV trails and horse trails should be permanently closed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 699    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,14,2014 13:10:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance is the closure of illegal roads and restoring natural conditions to those 50 miles of these roads; the closure of 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adding no new stream crossings; and barring vehicle access to gravel bars.

I would also suggest that weekly water quality testing be undertaken for E Coli, any other disease causing organisms, and for any suite of known water pollutants that are harmful to human health and the environment. Those water quality results should then be publicly disseminated to every person that may come into contact with the water so they can make an informed choice of subjecting themselves to health risks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 700    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,14,2014 15:53:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service,

I have been an enthusiastic visitor to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for decades. I learned my appreciation for Missouri forests, karst topography, and spring-fed streams and Missouri's varied plants and animals through dozens of hikes, canoeing and camping trips to the Ozarks. My favorite streams in Missouri are the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers while my favorite springs are the Bluespring, Round Spring and Big Spring.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the EIS. I would recommend the route of preservation and protection of our river ways by adopting Alternative A. I appreciate Alternative A because it closes illegal roads, 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and prohibits vehicle access to gravel bars. I also think its important to minimize, if not prohibit, stream crossings as this often results in siltation and foreign material left in the streams at the crossings. I urge you to support Alternative A.

Sincerely,  
Mark Bohnert

---

**Correspondence ID:** 701    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,14,2014 17:05:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think of all the miles of rivers that we are blessed with in our state. The least we can do is fully protect a few miles on a few rivers. In the long run, it will all be worth not allowing motorized vessels, within the river and it's basin. Make it the way it was meant to be.....wild. Please, save the land and the river (Jacks Fork) they are to precious. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 702    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,14,2014 17:24:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,

I just finished reading the plans for the management plan for Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I find Plan A somewhat encouraging but it truly does not go far enough in terms of conserving our states only national park. So much more could be done in terms of limiting traffic, roadways, and horsetrails which have already led to so much degradation of the beauty of this park. Please consider further action to limit overdevelopment, scenic easements, and overcrowding in general. It should be a place of wilderness as it was intended. We have plenty of State Parks over run with tourists. A national park should be something different.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 703 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,14,2014 18:44:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My grandparents raised a family of 8 kids on the Current River at Parker Hollow. The river & land was a source of food, water & recreation. If it had not been for wildlife the family would have been hard-pressed for survival. Now with this day & age I realize that families have other sources of survival. The river has been there for hundreds of years & will be for many more years. The use of it for food or recreation should remain as God had intended it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 704 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,14,2014 18:52:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There are many people in the Ozarks who want to see better management and a family-friendly atmosphere on the National Scenic Riverways. Those that are against the management plan are those that have control over local access areas and are doing a poor job of maintaining the natural beauty and water quality of the rivers. Advocating that the Riverways be "reclaimed" by the state may sound like a good idea, but in reality you can be sure they are not willing to pay for it. The National Scenic Riverways is a state and national treasure. It needs to be controlled by those that genuinely care and want to see it thrive for all who come to enjoy and respect it. Those that are squawking the loudest on this issue are those that only want to make a fast buck and a quick profit. They could care less about maintaining this beautiful treasure for future generations.

Thank you for your consideration on this very important issue.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 705 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,14,2014 19:38:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing concerning the draft General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. After reviewing the alternative plans, I would urge that Alternative B be adopted. This alternative would enhance opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources, and provide a balance of diverse recreational opportunities with increased opportunities for education and appreciation of park resources. To reduce motorized intrusion it would close undesignated roads and access points, restore 45 miles of such roads to natural condition, convert 10 miles of roads in primitive zones to hiking trails, and reduce and designate campsites on gravel bars open to vehicles. To reduce equestrian overuse it would add 35 miles of designated horse trails, close and restore 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and unauthorized river crossings, improve the design of the 23-mile-long currently designated horse trail system to avoid sensitive areas, establish a permit system for horse use with the park, and may allow for designated horse camping sites To improve visitor experience there would be a new learning center and visitor contact station at Powder Mill; two additional campground at existing day use areas at Akers on the Current and Blue Spring on the Jack's For; additional trails; a resumed oral history program, discovery sites, and enhancement of archive and museum collections; and strengthened monitoring, research, and preservation projects. The Cedar Grove low water crossing would be replaced with a high-water bridge. Waste systems in the park would be improved. There are staffing increased under this alternative as well.

I believe that Alternative B provide the most balance among the three alternatives. Several additional improvements I agree with include:

Maintenance of scenic easements and enforcement of easement violations.

Horsepower limits with inclusion of motor-free zones.

Increasing the number of hiking trails overall.

Development of a concession horse camping operation outside the park.

Restoration of impaired riverbanks.

Continued preservation of undeveloped backcountry/wildland areas, including the use of prescribed fire to manage wildland quality.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 706    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,14,2014 20:55:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Gentlemen;

I am very disappointed that NPS seems to be dragging it's feet in enforcing Rules and regulations that already exist. I must insist you adopt option A for your new management plan. Please stop dragging your feet and enforce the rules and clean up these rivers so all of us can enjoy the natural beauty of the area.

Thank you  
Ron D.Brann

---

**Correspondence ID:** 707    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,14,2014 21:16:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Your children and mine deserve the opportunity to appreciate these two great rivers that have been set aside and protected as NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS. I hope for the sakes of your family and ours that we have the foresight and diligence to pay the price to keep these rivers pristine for the children of the future.

I want to thank the National Park Service for an honest analysis. Alternative B is a good step but we ask you to provide the additional protections of ALTERNATIVE A.

We've been blessed to enjoy these rivers for over 40 years. We ask that you help protect them so your grandchildren and ours will have the opportunity to be as awed by their beauty as we have had.

Sincerely, Dr. Jay, Donna, Samantha, JD, Hazel & Jack Hodges

---

**Correspondence ID:** 708    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,14,2014 22:54:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Superintendent, Ozark National Scenic Riverways P.O. Box 490 Van Buren, MO 63965  
Subject: the General Management Plan

Dear Superintendent:

I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. In 2013 we witnessed the United States federal government experience a government shutdown. In that shutdown the overextended federal government identified services that were not essential to the operation of the federal government. Parks, waterways and memorials were deemed nonessential. In a time of an over extended federal government this is an excellent place to say "NO new action be taken", at minimum. In fact I would suggest that in light of the federal government's actions of depriving citizens of the use of "our citizen's parks, memorials and waterways" The federal government should no longer be entrusted with these public properties. I suggest that these properties be turned over to the care of the states in which they are found. Therefore I feel there should be no increase in federal activity or authority relevant to proposal A, B, OR C "NO new action be taken". Response to Question 1: "NO new action be taken" Response to Question 2"NO new action be taken" Response to Question 3:

"NO new action be taken" Response to Question 4: "NO new action be taken"

---

**Correspondence ID:** 709 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 06:49:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Superintendent, Ozark National Scenic Riverways P.O. Box 490 Van Buren, MO 63965  
Subject: the General Management Plan

Dear Superintendent:

I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. In 2013 we witnessed the United States federal government experience a government shutdown. In that shutdown the overextended federal government identified services that were not essential to the operation of the federal government. Parks, waterways and memorials were deemed nonessential. In a time of an over extended federal government this is an excellent place to say "NO new action be taken", at minimum. In fact I would suggest that in light of the federal government's actions of depriving citizens of the use of "our citizen's parks, memorials and waterways" The federal government should no longer be entrusted with these public properties. I suggest that these properties be turned over to the care of the states in which they are found. Therefore I feel there should be no increase in federal activity or authority relevant to proposal A, B, OR C "NO new action be taken". Response to Question 1: "NO new action be taken" Response to Question 2 "NO new action be taken" Response to Question 3: "NO new action be taken" Response to Question 4: "NO new action be taken"

Tom Clark

---

**Correspondence ID:** 710 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 06:54:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello I love our National Parks and I come to ONSR the most of any unit. I have been going there since the early days. My first time was in 1972. I have seen many changes over the years and most of them have been for the worst. We need more Rangers. Cedar Grove is dangerous after dark as it is a "party hole" for local tough guys. There are drug buys. I'm afraid to camp there anymore. I have had trouble there before when a young girl came into our camp who was trying to elude some guys that she said wanted to rape her. Next on my list is the fact that the concessionaires are licensed to put in way to many canoes. I can't even come there in the summer. It's been like that for years. I have seen the river with so many canoes in it that you could walk across the river by stepping in the boats. It's grid lock. These concessionaires, contrary to popular believe don't have to become millionaires in year or two. Thirdly there are to many ways that people can get ORV's down to the river. They load them up with party supplies and they ride them back empty. I have seen the debris left over many times next to the river at the end of the ORV trail. Next I would like to say that outboard engine displacement should be at a minimum on the Current from Round Spring on up to Baptist Camp and on the jacks Fork from Eminence on up to the prongs. I am delighted to read that portions of the ONSR are being considered for Wilderness status. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 711 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 07:35:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** TAKE NO ACTION.I AM AGAINST ANY FURTHER ROAD CLOSURES AND WILDERNESS PROPOSALS, AS THEY GO AGAINST THE ORIGINAL PARK MISSIONS OF RECREATION AND PRESERVATION OF CULTURAL AND HISTORICAL PRESERVATION.THE PARK IS OVERREGULATED NOW. THE GOOD PEOPLE ARE BEING PUNISHED FOR THE ACTIONS OF A FEW BAD PERSONS.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 712 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 08:30:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Really.....

I just received notice of the rescheduled meetings yesterday (1/14) and was surprised to see meetings scheduled for tomorrow and Friday (2/17) in Eminence and Salem, respectively.

I have already been inconvenienced twice by the late notice of cancellation of previously scheduled meetings in time



and money. Now, very little notice of rescheduled meetings. I guess it is too late to suggest the NPS get its act together.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 713    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 09:13:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am an Ozark stream fan and user. I encourage the NPS to adopt Alternative A. I realize this is more restrictive, but the scenic nature of these streams will continue to degrade under Alternative B.

Please adopt Alternative A of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan.

Ronda Sprick  
A Paddler

---

**Correspondence ID:** 714    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 09:32:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family has floated the Current and Jack's Fork for over 40 years. We endorse Plan A, but if that is not feasible, then at least adopt Plan B.  
The "locals" need to understand that the river belongs to all citizens and not exclusively to them.  
Protection of the rivers needs to be extended to the Arkansas border.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 715    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 09:43:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm writing to express support of Alternative B from the Draft Management Plan for Ozark Scenic Riverways. It provides the best balance of public access and resource management for the area. It is also important that this area be studied in this fashion from time to time to preserve and protect its resources in perpetuity.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 716    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 12:15:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan.  
The rivers need to be protected for ecological and economic reasons.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 717    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 12:18:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** January 15th, 2014

Ozark National Scenic Riverways  
404 Watercress Drive  
PO Box 490  
Van Buren, MO 63965

To whom it may concern:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). We appreciate the time and thought that goes into developing a range of alternatives.

One of the most critical issues facing ONSR is the loss of staff to manage and protect this precious landscape. While we like the most ecological option (Alternative A), we don't believe this option-without additional enforcement- will lead to the results needed to protect ONSR and allow visitors to enjoy it fully. Alternative B seems to provide

the greatest long term protection for ONSR particularly if some of the modifications mentioned below are incorporated into the plan.

Please ensure the easement remain in place and provide access to visitors. That said, monitoring and enforcement of the easements are critical to the protection of ONSR.

Wilderness protection is the gold standard for ensuring that future generations have access to wildlands. We support managing 3,430 acres of ONSR as wilderness even though official designation is beyond the scope of Alternative B. These lands can be managed with controlled burns to protect the lands and move toward restoration of natural process until such time as Congress acts to include them in the Wilderness System.

We support the limits of motorized use in Alternative B. Motor-free zones are important to ensure that all types of users have access to the type of recreational experience of preference. Quiet recreation is important. In particular the area across from Welch Spring Park needs to be closed to motor vehicle use and the unauthorized roads and traces restored to their natural condition.

Hiking is a popular activity for many of the ONSR users. Please increase the number of hiking trails that afford quiet recreation. The 15 miles of additional trails proposed in Alternative A should be the minimum expansion of the hiking trail system. We encourage you to consider converting even more than 15 miles of unauthorized roads in primitive area to additional hiking trails.

Camping is a high-impact activity. Yet, camping close to ONSR is important for people to really experience the area. Please consider working with local business/agencies/groups to establish camping outside of ONSR. This makes camping possible and still protects ONSR.

Restoration of the landscape must be a cornerstone of the plan. While some protection is required for archaeological sites and structures, these should be limited to those that the public can view from designated routes. Restoration, not transforming the landscape, must be the priority. Protect riparian areas and restore upland meadows and woodlands to their natural state. Restoration allows ecosystem function naturally. Artificial manipulation of the area destroys wildlife corridors and ecological process critical to a healthy system.

Avoid development around riverbanks. Healthy rivers are foundational to a healthy ecosystem. Do all you can to bring the river back to its natural condition. This, not engineering feats, is what we need to save ONSR for future generations.

Ensure monitoring and control of erosion caused by motor vehicles. Unauthorized roads leave ruts and lead to erosion. This damage leads to loss of natural conditions and deprives visitors of opportunities to view an intact landscape instead of a maze of eroding roads.

ONSR is an important tourist destination and is important to the local economy. A well-managed park that allows visitors the opportunity to be awed by its natural beauty is worth protection. Protection will not occur without management that protects as much of the naturalness of the area and that provides adequate monitoring and enforcement to ensure the protection of this natural jewel.

Sincerely

Billie J. Hughes (Nutrioso, AZ)  
Russell Winn (Nutrioso, AZ)

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	718	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,15,2014 13:06:54				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of Plan B for the Ozark National Scenic river ways. The crowding on these rivers has resulted in making them nearly unusable by any nature loving person. We need to preserve our natural resources and historic landmarks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 719    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 14:47:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alternative A. However I would place greater restriction on equestrian and motor vehicle use.

I am a Missouri Master Naturalist (Booneslick Chapter) and would be willing to volunteer one week to help monitor equestrian and motor vehicle abuse in the OSR. I would support additional ranger visibility during peak floating times in order to quell rowdiness and profanity.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 720    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 15:01:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I own a home on the current river in Doniphan, Mo. My question to you as a government employee( I pay your salary)is why are you doing all of this? Mind your own business, and leave law abiding citizens alone. The environmental movement is continuing to destroy this country.You can see what happens when government is all knowing by looking at obamacare. You know in your heart this law is awful, and history will prove this. Bottom line, leave us alone. Robin Robertson, Pharmacist and law abiding citizen.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 721    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 15:36:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a citizen of Missouri I wish to voice my support for the proposed General Management Plan which will strengthen the management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I am now in my late sixties and have floated both the Current River and the Jacks Fork River many, many times in my life time - even before they became Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Many of these trips have been three day canoe trips with camping on gravel bars. These trips have increased the quality of my life immensely - in fact these resources have been instrumental in deciding to live my life in Missouri. During my last few trips I have noticed a degradation in water quality due to crossings of ATVs and roads leading to the water's edge. This has also negatively impacted the feel of being in a wild area. Without increased regulations, you only have to observe the Black River near Johnson Shut Ins over the Labor Day weekend to see what might become of these wonderful river resources. Yes, these rivers must be used and enjoyed by citizens but not indiscriminately so. We owe it to future citizens to also preserve the wild nature of the rivers. These two objectives can only be met with increased management.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 722    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 18:32:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep up the good work!

Please press forward with Alternative A because it will do the most to preserve this wonderful area for future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 723    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe that NPS recommended Plan B if adopted would be ok. HOWEVER, I PREFER PLAN A as it gives additional protections I believe our rivers need. I have lived in the Ozarks for many years and cringe at some of the abuse I've seen in the National Park located here - our beloved Current/Jacks Fork National Scenic River. Three wheelers driving as they please; overuse of the forest and river by the huge Emminence horse back rides, etc. I THEREFORE PREFER PLAN A MAINLY FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

- It closes 60 or more miles of undesignated horse trails

(I've never participated in the Eminence trail ride but once when we were in the area during one, my husband and I went over to the camp to see what it was like. Shocking. Hundreds of horses, trampled ground, poop, etc everywhere. I can only imagine what gets in our streams. I'm only thankful that our place is upstream from those

gatherings, NOT downstream.

- It adds no new stream crossings

(More times than I can count, I've seen 4-wheel drive vehicles and motor cycles and 3 wheelers just cross a the Jacks and Current and others anywhere they please)

- It closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to miles of them.

(I've lived in the Ozarks for over 30 years - and know there are many such illegal roads - they should be eliminated)

- It bars vehicle access to gravel bars

(I've seen jeeps stuck in gravel bars after getting to them by careening thru the forest OR driving off the designated river access pad across gravel bars in less than optimum conditions)

Thanks for all your hard work. Our Rivers are among the best in the country. We need to protect them from ever more abusive use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 724 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,15,2014 19:46:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I and my family have enjoyed the Current River many times, since before it was nationalized. We recognize that provisions must be made to accommodate the large number of people who visit. The comments of the Ozark Wilderness Waterways Club look reasonable an constructive.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 725 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,15,2014 21:02:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing as a concerned citizen regarding the effects the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Draft General Management Plan, will have to the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. Shutting down access to these rivers will have devastating effects on our community. This Draft General Management Plan makes no economical sense or plain common sense. This Plan sounds like it is part of the United Nations' Agenda 21. Confiscation of private property under the guise of "sustainability." These types of tyrannical gestures are being implemented all around our country. This Plan could seize private property basically on a whim, using "sustainability" as the excuse. I strongly recommend that the National Park Service take the No-Action Alternative to prevent any additional restrictions on our public lands.

William Hohn

---

**Correspondence ID:** 726 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 08:27:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like the NPS management plan to be left UNCHANGED. My family and I have enjoyed canoeing, camping, boating and fishing the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers for many generations and have seen many changes in rules and regulations on these rivers. I feel our rights to these Recreational opportunities are being infringed upon more and more by government-lead officials trying to take away our citizen's rights to tax-paid government lands! Please leave our recreation alone! We love camping on gravel bars as well as in maintained NPS parks, fishing in our favorite spot, and boating in all areas! Thank you for allowing public comment, I pray you hear what our native Missourians are saying in this matter and make decisions based not just on what government wants but what We The People want also.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 727 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 08:59:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of Alternative B, and the socially and environmentally-responsible, mixed-use recreation that it supports. NPS is often the scape-goat of petty political point scoring, despite their history of excellent stewardship.

Keep up the good work. Your fire management program is excellent, and deserves more support from overhead.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 728 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 10:13:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family , friends , and I have been gigging and fishing on current river , in the Akers, Pulltite area since before it was 'aquired' by the park service. To do this, especially to gig, an outboard motor is a necessity. please consider local traditions in your decision. Philip Ziske Salem Mo

---

**Correspondence ID:** 729 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,16,2014 10:22:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I wish for there to be no action taken on the pursuit of the Federal Government extending its control of our rivers and surrounding land in the state of Missouri.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 730 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,16,2014 10:24:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family has enjoyed fishing on current river since long before it was 'aquired' by the park service. My 87 year old father has come to the point in his life where along float is almost impossoble. He enjoys putting his canoe in at the mouth of sinkin creek, fishihg to round spring, where friends shuttle him back to his truck. your barricades have made this difficult for him. Philip Ziske Salem

---

**Correspondence ID:** 731 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,16,2014 10:34:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have enjoyed fishing on current river since before it was 'aquired' by the park service, especially going to pulltite in the evening motoring up a little way, fishing back down, catching some tasty goggleye for supper. Your ban on outboard motors would put an end to this. Please consider local people and their traditions. Philip Ziske Salem

---

**Correspondence ID:** 732 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,16,2014 14:40:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the NPS Preferred Alternative B. Designating low density use areas or a designated family float only area on the river is a great idea. Perhaps it would be possible to keep the loud and intoxicated partiers in one area. Floating with a girlfriend, wife or family during this time is only inviting verbal abuse from these groups. To truly enjoy the Riverways, try floating in the off season. By this time the loud obnoxious groups are gone. The peace and quiet during this time is what OZAR was set aside for. The wildlife is also abundant then. Would it be possible to set up quiet zones where loud offensive noise is restricted? I also believe that the density of boaters should be regulated. Summers are pretty much bank to bank floaters. I don't know how you would eliminate alcohol entirely. Maybe just the abusers. I enjoyed a beer or too myself when floating. I support closing back country roads and river crossings but good luck in working with the counties in developing a partnership. Limiting organized horse groups would help in keeping the water quality higher. Good luck in implementation of the NPS Preferred Alternative B.

Tell that Chief of Maintenance of yours that he needs to get to work and quit goofing off. Just kidding.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 733 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,16,2014 14:47:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I love the current and the jacks fork rivers i have been floating them since the early 70s. I have seen a steady decline in the river experience in that time. Most notably too much access to the river by atvs where they should not be. Too many rental canoes on weekends in summer. I would love all or parts of the rivers to become Wilderness areas, or i believe we will lose the wilderness feel of these rivers, I know everyone has there own ax to grind but these are supposed to be Ozark Wild & Scenic Riverways, and i feel we are losing the wild and

scenic part rapidly. Thank you John Romano

---

**Correspondence ID:** 734 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 16:11:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been camping with my kids and friends on the Current River since the 1980s usually two to three times a year, until I relocated to WV in 2010. I still have a residence in St. Louis. My son is in law school at Mizzou. All my family has fond memories of their canoe trips on the pristine Current during all seasons of the year. Winter is especially beautiful with wood ducks in the water and bald eagles overhead. Piliated woodpeckers are present all year. The solitude in the spring and fall are what I long for. Please keep these rivers clean and safe.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 735 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 17:00:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 1. No more restrictions on flat-bottom gigging boats or horsepower limitations.

2. No more restrictions on horseback riding.

3. No more closing of roads and trails.

4. Welch Spring Area - on Hartshorn side of river - need to open campsites and fix roads, need to train park rangers, such as Bill McKinny, that they work for they work for the people, not the government. We pay his paycheck. There are threats and poor attitudes.

5. Park Service needs to get over their prejudice against ATV's and UTV's.

6. According to DNR, Jefferson City, water quality is worse now, than when park service took land away from the farmers in 19644.

7. Cut park service employees wages, and give to retired veterans. From the superintendent on down.

8. Quit driving Chevy Tahoes and top of the line crew cab Ford F-150 pickups. Use lower cost vehicles to save taxpayer money.

9. Quit catering to the inner city crowd and look out for the local people for a change.

10. Obey the Constitution of the United States and the State of MO.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 736 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 17:15:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the No-Action Alternative. Alternative A is too restrictive for those who live and enjoy the rivers. Many parts of Alternative C are encouraging, but it may go too far in its zeal.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 737 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 17:29:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** i feel that no action would be the best option. I have been on the river my entire life. My father owns a cabin above williams landing. He inherited this cabin from my grandfather. I will eventually inherit this cabin. I do not believe there should be any more road closings or any further limitations on motor boats. I don't want any access points closed. There have been numerous times that I have assisted floaters who have flipped over and lost their possessions. This past summer a man and women was stuck on a rootwad above jerktail landing. My wife and i was heading up the river, the man could not swim and was hanging on to the rootwad. Their canoe was completely sunk in fast moving water. i used my boat to rescue the man who was scared to the point that once to the bank he was shaking. I then took my rope off my anchor and tied it to their canoe and pulled the canoe out. while during the process of pulling the canoe out my front handle broke off my boat. once we got both the man and wife and all their possessions that we could find we realized that they did not have a paddle. I gave them my own

personal paddle so they could make it to 2 rivers.

I would also like to say that if the rivers have gotten so out of hand, then more patrolling of the rivers by the rangers should be utilized. You can't drive down the highway over 100 miles without seeing a highway patrolmen but you can go practically anywhere on the river and very seldom will you see a ranger.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 738 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,16,2014 17:37:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have lived in this area my entire life and have used and enjoyed this river. i vote for no action on your proposals and belief that the park service needs to be taken out of this area and returned back to the citizens of the area. We as boaters hunter and fisherman take care of the river and keep it clean and help out the canoers when the tip over or need medical assistance. Not the park service.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 739 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,16,2014 17:38:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Ozark Scenic Riverways has been a quiet retreat from our busy lives since its inception. The last time we visited, in 1994 for my Dad's 99 1/2 birthday, the River was full of innertubing beer drinkers, not the quiet canoe camping trips we had enjoyed earlier.  
Along with the NPS and Friends of the Ozark Riverways, we prefer plan B, which would curb the misuse of the trails and banks of the Rivers.  
Please help us preserve this wonderful treasure for our children and future generations. Keep us from destroying that which we love.

sincerely, Cynthia Null

---

**Correspondence ID:** 740 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,16,2014 17:39:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly disagree with this movement!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 741 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,16,2014 17:44:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe the majority of Shannon, Dent, Reynolds, and even Texas county would be adversely affected by any action aside from no action. It would close much of the tourism trade and all the business that sustains these counties. Definitely it would affect the abilities to enjoy the rivers by many disabled and heavily burdened tourists and residents alike. Please choose no action as that will be the only action allowed by the good people of these counties. That is the bottom line. We need to educate our children about these wilderness areas and allow them the same access that we have enjoyed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 742 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,16,2014 17:49:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The rivers and Parks should stay as is, no action. Any action chosen from the ones presented would adversely affect tourism, family life, businesses, livelihoods and would anger nearly every citizen in nearly every county that has a National park river system or horse trail in it.. The people of Missouri will not abide by any action aside from no action.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 743 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,16,2014 18:34:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I do not agree with the proposed plan. I don't think it is very well organized. When attending a meeting, any questions asked of the park service employees were not answered in a straight manner. They had no real answers. They said that area was something that needed working on. That should have been worked on before

all of this took place. I feel that the current plan should stay in place. For one, I feel that the government already has too much control on the park now. It is going to hurt the livelihood of local residents who have resided here their whole life or who have moved here to start a new life and will be more than likely have to close their business because of the repercussions of the proposed plan. I think the group of people who have come up with this plan don't even live here, and have too much time on their hands getting paid way too much for it. The impact on local economy will be bad. Not only will more people have to depend on state and federal aid because of lack of jobs (i.e. food stamps, housing), but there will likely be more crime as a result of less jobs should this go into effect. God made this land for everyone, there should not be restrictions on it's use because some tree hugger wants their way and has never or probably will never have to experience what it' like in the real world of the working man.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 744 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 18:36:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a resident of Shannon County in Missouri, which I was born and raise here all my life. Furthermore, have ridden horse and hunted in the areas, camping on the Jack Fork and Current Rivers and have enjoyed the beauty and the serenity of nature. To be able to enjoy the wild life and the fish that are in our rivers and streams.

Whether camping or horseback riding nature is God's gift to us.

When it comes to visitor's to the surrounding area they should be able to enjoy it as much as the locals do. Should be able to experience what is not in the city's.

In the plan that they are suggesting is trying to take away the rights and the privileges from the locals as well as the visitor's.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 745 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 18:49:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 1. Why does the National Park Service ignore or discourage "Traditional Activities?" Such as...Motor boating; camping; trapping; more free river access.

2. How could the National Park Service close a road like Pothole Road when it is a public roadway that has had money expended on it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 746 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 19:02:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm for the no action plan. I've been boating on the current river since I was just a kid with my family. We spent a lot of weekends camped out and have always enjoyed being able to go down and boat ride, fish, and swim. My personal view on the HP restriction is it just going to make things worse. If a jet boat is underpowered it makes it harder to maneuver, causes a bigger wake because it can't get enough speed to properly plane out(get on top of the water. Plus you've got people that bring there families and friends with them, they need all the power they can get to bring them along. What if a family has a bunch of kids it's not like they can leave a few behind while you take the others up stream to drop the off to go back for the others. I don't know how many times boater have had to help canoers out. Whether it someone tipping over and losing there stuff or some one getting injured. I know I've retrieved items that floated down river while they try to get there canoe back in order. Most of the time they're to drunk to even say that's, but I still make an effort to help. The canoe rentals need to better inform canoers about jet boats. Most people don't realize that the slower a boat goes the bigger the wake behind it gets. They also don't understand that a jet boat can just stop and start anywhere. If the water is to shallow you have a chance of grounding the boat. Most people have \$10,000 or more invested into a boat and I know I don't want to be beating the bottom out of my boat because a canoers can't share the river. Even if you don't ground the boat there still and chance of sucking up gravel which could ruin a \$200 impeller and a \$50 liner or a \$350 shoe. If the canoe rental would explain those few simple facts it would help boaters and canoers relation on the river.

As far as the erosion goes what about every time the river floods? It gets huge. That's a lot of water and a lot of force. I'm sure the flood causes more erosion then horses, atvs, and boats cause. Entire bends in the river can change because of a flood. Can a horse, atv or boat do that? People complain about the horses crossing the river and how they cause erosion and defecate in the water as they cross. If we ban horses from crossing the river what do we do about the population of wild horses? Do we exterminate them? Or the deer or the elk that are sure to make there way



on to the ONSR sooner or later?

I don't feel that it's right for people that don't even live in this area to be able to tell us that we can't enjoy what we have in our back yards because they don't like the way we do it. They want to change a way of life for us just so they can have one weekend of relaxation.

When I'm older and have a family of my own I want to be able to take them to river and show them how I spent my time growing up on the Current river not just be able to show them pictures and tell them stories of when you could boat ride on the Current river. That's just my 2 cents on it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 747 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 19:20:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I favor the NPS' preferred plan and would even be amenable to a more restrictive plan. The increase in population coupled with more intense park usage demands that reasonable restrictions and regulations be implemented. As a sixth-generation Carter Countian, I do not agree with those claiming riparian "rights" bestowed by local tradition. When the park was established a ten horsepower prop motor on a wooden john boat was considered to be more than adequate for motoring up river. That is tradition. The proposed limits do not infringe upon that. The park is a national park- -not a county park- -and should be administered under a management plan which will allow reasonable use, restrict abusive practices, and, in so doing, preserve the natural beauty of the rivers for the enjoyment of all citizens, present and future. The preferred plan is both reasonable and appropriate.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 748 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 19:22:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Limiting or preventing access to the Current River will be truly devastating to everyone that live in or around the surrounding areas. People will lose incomes even jobs because many businesses rely on tourism. Many locals have spent every summer of their lifetime fishing, camping, and boating on the river. My family meets at the same part of the gravel bar every sunny Sunday after church lets out for a barbeque and a swim. Every year we dedicate one weeks vacation to camping at the Log yard gravel bar and boating up and down the river with our two children. It is so peaceful on cloudless Summer nights around the bonfire roasting marsh mellow listing to the frogs and river flowing in the background. This is the one place where it seems you can disappear from the chaos of the world and one of our best freedoms as an Americans. Changing anything will crush our community and personal lives. As locals we preserve and care for the river and its surroundings.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 749 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 19:47:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have spent every weekend of the summer on current river for my entire life. The thought of someone taking that away angers me. I would hate for my children not to be able to enjoy it the way i have. We have a place three miles from the log yard and we camp on the gravel bar for at least a week every summer. We camp in a camper so if you eliminate that we will no longer be able to enjoy camping. You all need to think about the positive things campers and boaters bring. Every boater i know has saved someone canoeing. I have also picked up a lot of trash left behind and it was never from a local or a boater. So please just leave us alone!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 750 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 22:30:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I favor the strongest protections for ONSR. If I must choose a plan I choose plan A. I totally disagree with the use of ATVs in the river. There could be plenty of horse trails near the river but not through it. I visited ONSR at least three times last year and hope to visit more this summer. I am also visiting Big Bend National Park, Grand Canyon, and Yellowstone; I am the tourist ONSR wants. I won't be a partier, will not litter, and will respect our park. And I will spend money. But it must remain pristine for the park to retain its magic. Thank you for respecting our national treasure.

Diane Wilke O'Leary

---

**Correspondence ID:** 751 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 07:22:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My fiancé and I are huge nature lovers and we spend many weekends camping and floating along Missouri rivers. Many of our friends share our passion for nature and we would like to see it preserved and protected. I favor the strongest possible plan to protect these rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 752 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 07:55:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** No action Plan ... I feel there should be more roads open and more gravel bars open ..no restriction on horse power on boats.. I like to go fishing and take my family to the river ...I feel the NPS takes poor care of the river and the park .. If they would do there job...

---

**Correspondence ID:** 753 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 07:56:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to express my concern in regards to the horse trail proposal. As a local resident I would have to express that I see a lot less horse issues causing environmental issues verses the thousands of human waste left in the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. I am not asking or seeking to stop people from using the river ways, I am asking to reconsider you move to stop or restrict local equestrian people who try to respect and obey all those they come in contact with in or near the NPS. I realize there are those who do not obey the rules and for those who do not deal with them in the proper way and continue to allow those who do to enjoy to continue to ride without fear of being harassed for enjoying their freedom to do what they enjoy as much as the person floating the beautiful river ways. If there is a change that needs to be made to he trails and crossings wouldn't it be better idea to glean some valuable thoughts from the trails ride campgrounds owners in whom some may feel have the biggest impact on the areas in question

---

**Correspondence ID:** 754 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 08:23:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In response to the accessibility of vehicles on selected gravel bars I fell would be a slam on the local people being able to go and enjoy the beauty of the Current and Jacks Fork River. I know it would make it easier to just allow tourist to use the gravel bar with out any local people being there but those folks are only here maybe 1-2 times a year and the local people live her year round. What I see in this proposal is we the local people need to stay away or act like the tourist. Drinking, drugging, and acting like animals. Each time I use the river in the NPS I remove all my trash, I make sure I leave it better than I found it and I try my best to respect others who are using the river even though they may not be acting appropriate. In my opinion this is not how the tourist leave the areas they use for the most part. I know there is no way to for the NPS to monitor every inch of both the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, but I feel there are ways to make the gravel bars open to all whether as a local or a person who come to the area to visit all the counties who will be impacted by this proposal.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 755 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 08:33:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am having a really hard time with more NPS control of a place that is and has been a part of my family for over a hundred years. If those people that don't enjoy it the same way we do, they need to just stay away. My Mother's dream was for her children to have a place on Current River to have all of our family functions so we could stay close as a family, and then to see posts that say that our cabin is a disgrace and that it was a scandalous land trade is very hurtful.

It would not ever come to my mind, to see a beautiful cabin sitting on a high bluff and to think- --What an eyesore. It would not matter where I was. I just cannot imagine the mentality of a person that would think that.

I am very disappointed with what our country is coming too. Government takeover is out of control.

This all began in 1966/67, for my family. They took land from my family then and we are still having to fight for our right to hang on to what we have. This is getting real old.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 756 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 08:34:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like NO CHANGE on this plan. The Current River has been the summer vacation spot for me for over 20 years and my family's for longer than that. My grandmother was raised on this river and my father has raised my siblings and I to know this river as our "second" home. Further more, my husband and his family have been raised in an area where the river is practically in their back yards. To have this part of our lives taken away would be devastating. It would take away the opportunity for many people to enjoy and be apart of one of God's greatest gifts to Missouri. I for one would love to have the chance to raise my children to be able to go to the river and learn to love it as I have, the same chance my parents had and their parents before them. Again I would like to see NO CHANGE to the plan. Thank you and God Bless!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 757 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 08:43:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the no action because i want the river, the roads,the camp sites. To assessable for me and my family to go fishing and canoeing and swimming cause that is the only fun things to do in the summer.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 758 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 08:47:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support No action Plan . I feel there should be more roads open and more gravel bars open .No restriction on horse power on boats.. I like to go fishing and take my family to the river ..I feel the NPS takes poor care of the river and the park . If they would do there job . Fishing is a way of life for some people

---

**Correspondence ID:** 759 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 08:49:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In regards to the proposal of restricting the use of ATV, UTV and off road vehicles. As a local tax pay and a cancer victim, I use my UTV on roads that are already existing to get to places on the NPS and County because I am not able to walk very far. I have my flag, slow moving sign, county permit, lights and all that a person needs to be responsible in the use of this vehicle. I also have my drivers licenses. I know there have been some issues with under age drivers using ATV's, UTV's and off road vehicles in the past. I have spoken with one of the ranges in regards to this issue with the exception of explaining why (cancer issue) I use my UTV the way I do. I do not go out on the gravel bars and turn circles. I don't make new roads to get the best fishing spot, I don't try to out think what the Law states to do what I want to do. I do try to respect all those I come in contact with whether it be a person using the river, horseback riders or someone just walking in the road. In stead of trying to stop all local people from using what is theirs, who try to respect those they come in contact with, try stopping those who are not driving with a legal licenses, to many on the vehicle in areas they should not be, those who are destroying the gravel bars and making new roads. As for me in this proposal you are going to stop me as a tax payer and a local citizen who has a health issue from being able to continue to use the Current or Jacks Fork River. I have lived in this area all my life and it makes me very sad to know that I would not be able to continue to go and be able to fish, swim and just have a great time with my family in areas that we have used for years. Again why could we not as find a way to sit down and look at this issue and try to work out a better way of working for all involved?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 760 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 08:52:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support No action Plan .. There is generation of family heritage taken away from us. I feel there should be more roads open and more gravel bars open . No restriction on horse power on boats.. I like to go fishing and take my family to the river ...I feel the NPS takes poor care of the river and the park . They can't even cut the grass at power mill.. You probable don't now were it is at..

---

**Correspondence ID:** 761 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 08:56:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I feel there are enough rules and restrictions for the National Scenic Riversways.I would like to see them stay with the no-action alternative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 762 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 08:58:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I feel there are enough rules and restrictions for the National Scenic Riversways.I would like to see them stay with the no-action alternative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 763 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 08:59:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the no action plan. I think the river ways should be a public place.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 764 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 08:59:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In terms of the NPS protecting "our" river ways- I'd like to submit the following comments. First and foremost, my concern along with many others is the devastating impact your proposals would have on our community. Small businesses, schools, and our way of life (basically "our" habitat) would cease to exist. We would therefore have to "migrate" to another location, giving up our culture, way of life, and inheritance. Our economy is based on the ability to provide these natural resources to the public. Take this away and our businesses will cease to flourish. Our children will see there school close. Families will be uprooted and their stability and way of life will be threatened. Please consider "people" as we'll as our natural resources. Yes, protect the river ways (enforce thoe laws you have already), but don't forget the people who have been protecting them for a couple hundred years already.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 765 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 09:02:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the no action plan. I support the rivers and the activity that you are able to do like my favorite gigging.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 766 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 09:04:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the no action plan. I believe that the rivers should be open to the public. I love to go fishing, gigging, swimming, and going on boat rides.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 767 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 09:05:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Looking at the motor boat issue in regards to gigging I feel that we the local people continue to loose the right to use state waterways like the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers for reasons I am not sure about. Why is it necessary to put more restrictions on motor boats and restrict the river during gigging season on certain parts of the NPS seems to think they control. My question would be, why is it such an issue for the local people to use the Current and Jacks Fork River during gigging season when there are little to no tourist using the rivers at that time and gigging is done for the most part in the dark/night not in the day when most tourist are using the river. I have lived here all my life and I have yet to see a tourist swimming, floating, walking or what ever you would put there during this time of the year that would be disturbed by a gigging boat. My thoughts to this issue to have not action to be place on this matter.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 768 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 09:06:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** i support the no action plan. i love to swim boat ridin like fishin giggin so dont take the right away.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 769 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 09:42:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have grown up on this river and have rode horses, boated, hunted, and fished all up and down the current. I want my kids to be able to do the same. Park Rangers do not patrol the river and enforce the laws already in place. You all are trying to tell us our heritage and way of life is destroying the river. It is not. Most all of us locals try to keep the river and surrounding area clean and leave it the way we found it. Please leave the management plan the way it is and just enforce the existing laws.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 770 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 09:53:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I think I can speak for everyone in this area that we want no action to be taken. It seems like so many people who don't live here, probably have never been to the rivers, and don't understand our way of life, are the ones trying to keep us off the rivers. Being on current river is part of our lives, it's what we look forward to all year round. During the spring, we love to fish. During the summer we love to boat ride, fish, swim, etc, every single weekend (not to mention one or two days through the week). During the fall and winter we go gigging a few times a week, we also camp many times through the year. We don't liter the river, we do our part to keep it clean. We follow the laws that have already been set forth. We LOVE to be on the river, period. From the time I was old enough to go to the river, I have loved it, I don't want to see a day that my children won't get to enjoy it like I have. It's the place we go for family days (since everyone in my family owns a jet motor and blazer boat). I understand that Alternative B would still allow some river access, but that still crosses the line. If any action is taken now, but the time my kids are adults, the forest service will have already made 10 other acts that would eventually allow no access. It has been seen in other states. One small step is taken, then another, then another, until all is lost for people to enjoy. I know my family will continue to fight for the people's freedom to go to the river and enjoy it as it is now. Not to mention how the economies would be affected. Eminence and Van Buren rely on the revenue from tourists here to access our rivers, any proposition would end up destroying these towns! It feels like this has been a constant battle that we want ended! NO ACTION ALTERANTIVE!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 771 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 09:57:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the no action plan because i grew up on the river, and its a way of life for me, and many people living in this area. Growing up on the river is the only life i know, and without it i basically have nothing.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 772 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 10:03:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the no action plan because me and my family lived off the river. My family grew up around the river and that is how they survived. with closing the roadways we couldn't go see where the family was established and wouldn't be able to show my kids and grand-kids where the family first got started.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 773 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 10:04:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the NO ACTION PLAN. Keep all roads open, all boat ramps, and gravel bars.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 774 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 10:08:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We very much appreciate the work of the National Park Service to put together the well-done, thoughtful analysis that went into drafting the Draft General Management Plan for the future management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

While the adoption of Alternative B, recommended by the National Park Service, would be an improvement over the existing management of the ONSR, we don't believe it provides enough protection for this wonderful and unique area.

In order to adequately protect our national treasure we believe stronger protections need to be in place. Therefore we recommend the adoption of Alternative A because it provides for additional protections that include:

- o The closing of illegal roads and restoration of natural conditions along 50 miles of these roads;
- o The closing of 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings;
- o The barring of all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

We believe these are vital actions that need to be taken to better comply with the National Park Service's stated mission.

As people who have loved to visit, canoe, and camp in the ONSR area, it is the unique beauty and the solitude that we experienced years ago that has been so special to us.

Inappropriate use of motorized vehicles-motorboats and ATVs-and excessive numbers of horses with the impact to the natural beauty, water quality, and noise levels have greatly diminished the experience of visiting the ONSR. For those wishing to take part in these activities there are numerous opportunities outside the ONSR and they should not be permitted to degrade the natural area by these activities.

We believe that by adopting Alternative A, the National Park Service will come closer to fulfilling its mission:

to promote and regulate the use of the...national parks...which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." National Park Service Organic Act, 16 U.S.C.1.

Thank you for considering our concerns and request.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	775	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,17,2014 10:08:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support the NO ACTION PLAN. I like to swim, fish, and canoe. I also do not want roads to be closed down. I want a good environment to be able to swim and have fun with friends.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	776	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,17,2014 10:15:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I don't even know how to begin my comment. My grandfather is one of the men that this beautiful land was stolen from years ago. My mother grew up on these waters as did her parents before her. I have been truly blessed to live near and have a cabin on the current river for the last 33 years. I have spent every summer of that 33 years enjoying the peacefulness and beauty. Yes I have enjoyed it all in a jet boat! I truly can not imagine a time in my life that I would not be aloud to do such a thing. What bothers me most is that you have no REAL reason to do what your doing. You have no REAL proff that taking the boats and the horses off the river will have any real benifits. If horse poop is such a problem then it was most likely not a good idea to add elk in the mix. It makes me angry to think there might be a time when I have to have a permit to show my grandchildren current river. The river is like a medication to me it calms me as soon as I get on the gravel bar. It makes me happy! I vote for the no management option and I don't see any of the other options as coming close.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	777	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,17,2014 10:18:48				

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I love current river! I don't want to see anything changed. I want to be able to bring my family to the river someday. I vote for the no change option!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 778 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 10:19:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the no action plan because i would like the rivers, campgrounds, and roads to be assessable to me and my family for it is the only fun thing to do in the summer.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 779 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 10:22:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have for the no change option. I love current river just the way it is. And want to be able to enjoy it my whole life!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 780 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 10:22:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am registering my objection to any change to the ONSR general management plan. I believe the problems that exist could be overwhelmingly resolved by stricter enforcement of regulations currently in place but not rigorously enforced. Further regulation will not stop the deterioration of our rivers by outsiders who come in and play for a week and then leave the mess for locals to clean up.

Further regulation will, however, restrict local residents - many of whom, like myself, are fifth, sixth or seventh generation residents of the area - from visiting and enjoying our ancestral homes and cultural meeting places to swim, fish or picnic.

The original purpose of the ONSR - as promised to us - was to protect the recreational rights of all persons to the rivers and surrounding land (which, by the way, once belonged to our forefathers, not the government). Newer regulations and recent enforcement policies seem to be aimed at denying access to the very backbone of our heritage - our rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 781 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 10:25:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I think the no change option is the best. I want to be able to enjoy the river in 20 years just like I enjoy it now.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 782 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 10:30:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Mr. Black and all who will view this:

Please do not disregard this, let it be a learning tool to not make the same mistake that was made over 100 years ago.

I am sending this commit just to sum up how I feel as a local citizen of Shannon County and I feel that I speak for many others who live in this area and other counties.

What I see with the NPS is history being repeated. I go back to December 29, 1890 to a place far from Shannon County. I want to take you back to a place in South Dakota where a group of Lakota Indians were being forced to a place they did not want to go. The government seemed to feel that the Lakota Indians needed to be place in an area they could be better controlled. That place is called a reservation. About 350 Lakota people did not want to live on a reservation and they were only trying to defend what they had, known for many years.

What I see in the New Management Plan is exactly what the Lakota people were seeing, restriction of their rights, forced removal from their native land, and massacred for their resistance.

That is what I fear as a local, people who try desperately to hang onto what has been for years as those who sit behind a desk push a pencil with one stroke of ink seem to have the power to restrict and control a large group of people without any thought for their rights or feelings. As a local I feel just as the Lakota people who sit down and talked with the government, signed treaties, and felt like they were doing what was right and in return truly receive nothing.

I ask you Mr. Black and all who will be a part of the new rules and restriction. Will we as the local people be apprehended stripped of all our defenses and gunned down like the Lakota people were. If killing the Lakota people who would not submit to the government reservation was not the first intent why was 4 Hotchkiss canons need to peacefully control 350 Lakota Indians.

As I entered the public viewing of the New General Management Plan in the New Eminence High School gym last night (Jan 15) it became very obvious that only a chosen few was allowed to carry a side arm, night stick, mace, and this list could go on. If we feel that this plan is so right why the need to carry so much protection or to try to show authority over a group of people. For the most part we the local people are very peaceable until we are shoved into a corner I didn't see a person other than the NPS and one State Trooper with any kind of protection.

Speaking as just one person I am asking that you and the powers that be, take a step back, re-think and re-evaluate what is about to be pushed on the local people in not only Shannon County but he Counties that the NPS seem to control. Please don't let history repeat itself. Please do not continue to take away from the local people in the thought that everyone likes it or it is what is best for the people.

I am open to visit with you about your plan in a peaceful manner trying to resolve this without the government dealing with local people as the Lakota people were dealt with. Again I am only one person but I truly believe there are many others who are willing to try to figure out a better way than just pushing this Management Plan down the local people's throat.

Thank you in advance for your reconsideration and hopefully some very need discussion with some true local insight.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 783 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 10:42:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the no action plan. Being from the area, as long as I can remember I have been going to the river with my family. I cannot imagine not being able to. I would like the roads open to all river accesses and camp grounds. I want my family to be able to enjoy the rivers and campgrounds as I have.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 784 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 11:45:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the no action plan because the river is a place to relax and like for the roads to be open in certain places so i ccan go hiking running and camping

---

**Correspondence ID:** 785 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 11:50:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the No Action Plan because the river ways are a place for my friends and family to go during the summer and is important to the society where i live. Like to keep the roadways and camp grounds and river ways open to the public.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 786 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 11:57:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** i like the no action plan i'm a person who likes to keep the roads open and go to the river and go camping and keep the hp limit the same so i can get my family up and down the river safely



---

**Correspondence ID:** 787 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 12:01:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** ONSR Draft General Management Plan

I finally got into one of the public meetings for the Draft General Management Plan of Ozark National Scenic Riverways after driving to the last two meetings to find them rescheduled. Very disappointed again to find there was not going to be a meeting here in Eminence and instead it was just an open house. There was at least 20 or more National Park Service personnel there to hand out free cd 's of the complete Plan and answer questions, but there was no one there to answer questions and give you a truthful answer. Most all the local county and state officials that were there expected an open meeting where we could all ask questions and voice our opinion.

The tone of the open house was, "This Plan shows you what we are going to do to our river and and if you have a comment, you can write it down and place it in the box at the end of the table and someone will look at it later".

Why is the National Park Service going out of it's way to mislead all of us local folks??? What is really the big picture??? The greatest threat to our rivers and wilderness areas is the National Park Service.

If you like your river, you can keep your river, period... Does that sound familiar, where have we heard that before??? It is no wonder that no one trust the Federal Government or the National Park Service anymore. We have all been through this before with the "Blueways" System. We will never give up our rivers... All of us folks that live here and grew up here, like our rivers just as they are with no changes. I strongly recommend the National Park Service take the No-Action Alternative to their Draft General Management Plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 788 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 12:02:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** i support the no action plan because its the only way that my family will spend time together.if the roads are closed then me and my family can not do all the fun things we want to and at the same time we can spend time together.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 789 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 12:06:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think you should not shut down rivers. It is a big part of our lives. a lot of us people really enjoy the river. In my opinion it would be somewhat childish to take our rivers away from us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 790 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 12:21:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the no action plan .. MY mother was born and raise on current river. I have enjoyed the river all my life and my children have enjoyed the river.. i won't that tradition to go on down through the generation of my family.. By closing road, camp sites, and cutting horse power limit.. This will restrict the traditional sites that we my go camping, fishing, and boat riding.. people that make this ruling probable don't even live here and if they do, when there time is up they will pack there bags and go back were they call home..

---

**Correspondence ID:** 791 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 12:23:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the no action plan .. By closing road, camp sites, and cutting horse power limit.. This will restrict the traditional sites that we my go camping, fishing, and boat riding.. people that make this ruling probable don't even live here and if they do, when there time is up they will pack there bags and go back were they call home..

---

**Correspondence ID:** 792 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 12:27:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the no action plan .. By closing road, camp sites, and cutting horse power limit.. This will restrict the traditional sites that we my go camping, fishing, and boat riding.. By restricting boats and hp limit this is going to crowd certain areas and this is going to cause a problem..

---

**Correspondence ID:** 793 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 12:29:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the no action plan .. By closing road, camp sites, and cutting horse power limit.. This will restrict the traditional sites that we my go camping, fishing, and boat riding..

---

**Correspondence ID:** 794 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 12:29:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect our rivers so that they may be enjoyed by us and future generations. Missouri Rivers are a huge part of our lives.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 795 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 12:32:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the no action plan .. By closing road, camp sites, and cutting horse power limit.. This will restrict the traditional sites that we my go camping, fishing, and boat riding.. Give it back to the States Missouri. We will Take care of it .. We will at lease get the grass mowed..

---

**Correspondence ID:** 796 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 12:51:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Me being local resident I feel its my obligation to voice my opinion on the River ways Management Plan. In using the river for fishing, boating and horse back riding I feel I should speak on the behalf of all three recreations I indulge in. Whether we are boating or fishing while camping we always clean up when we leave the river the way we find it. The biggest pleasures we get IS Horse back riding. We enjoy all of the beautiful sights the river has to offer. A large number of us trail riders every spring we have what we call trail clean up. We clean trails up and down the river and miles each way from the river and I must say 95% othe trash comes from the river trails. We pick up beer and pop cans along with things I will not mention. I know for a fact that the horse people do not litter the river ways when just riding the trails. It mostly from the non local people who float the river. I don't know how much revenue the canoe people make for the federal and state government, but the horse industries bring in more than 40 billion dollars. With that being said I believe the folks making the decisions about the river should reconsider all the different avenues involved .

---

**Correspondence ID:** 797 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 12:51:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I was not raised on the banks of the Current River like some of my frieds and coworkers in fact I did not visit the Current River until I was 19 years old and an Enginnering student in Rolla at the Missouri School of Mines. Upon graduating with my Engineering degree I had job offers from around the country but the excitment of big cities like Dallas, Boston and Denver could not draw me away from my adopted home in Missouri. I new that this is where I wanted to work, live and raise my family. The Current River and surrounding areas is why.

Although I cannot say that life on and around the Current River is a part of my heritage (since I am a transplant from Illinois) this area is now a huge part of my children's heritage. My daughter is 19 years old and in her second year at the University of Missouri-Columbia and my son is a 17 year old senior at Salem R80 High School and the Current River and the surrounding forrests have been a huge part of their lives. I would venture to say that as a family we have spent at least 75 days per year in the ONSR since 1995. At first it was time spent in a tent camping in a primitive area (with no camping fees) and floating on innertubes we brought from home. We couldn't afford to rent a canoe or to pay to camp so we had to live cheap. When I had vacations from work we didn't pack up and drive to

Florida we loaded up our truck and drove 45 minutes down the road to the banks of the Current River. As time went on we were able to purchase a used pop-up camper and later a motorized jon boat so we could spend even more time and explore more areas on the Current River and in the ONSR. We would camp and boat nearly every weekend in the summer. We would use our jon boat to fish in the summer, gig frogs in late July and gig fish in mid-September through mid-January. We use our jon boat for transportation to and from our favorite deer hunting spots in the fall and turkey hunting locations in the spring. Our photo albums are full of pictures that center around our times on the Current River. This kind of life is all my children know so it is their heritage. I only hope that when they graduate college and start to raise families of their own they can pass this heritage on.

Over the years I have met many people on the river and have come to appreciate their personal heritage and understand how their usage of the ONSR has shaped their family lives. I am allergic to horses and I don't own enough land to board them but I have met a lot of good people who grew up trail riding in the ONSR before it was a national park, passed this heritage on to their children and are now passing it on to their grandchildren. Even though this is not a recreational use of the ONSR for me I cannot support any plan that keeps them from continuing to ride in areas where they historically have. This is their heritage. I have met a lot of fine people who grew up on the banks of the Current River and continue to visit the old home places they were raised even though there is only a stone foundation or concrete step remaining. I have stumbled upon several old family burial plots while hunting only to find an elderly person there reminiscing about their childhood on the river. Many of these old home sites and cemetery plots are only accessible by old roads. I cannot support any plan that blocks these roads and in effect keeps people from visiting these places that are a part of their heritage. Being a motor boater I have met lots of people on the river who have built a heritage for their family revolving around canoeing and gravel bar camping on the river. They are just as passionate about their recreational heritage as I am and I cannot support any plan that restricts them from camping on a gravel bar off by themselves or canoeing a certain part of the river because there are already too many people there.

One of the things that makes the ONSR so enjoyable for me is the diversity of the people you meet. Any changes to the GMP put in place to zone and segregate people will only divide people and keep people from enjoying their preferred means of recreation in the locations they choose.

As I read through the General Management Plan for the ONSR one recurring theme came to mind: For a "General" plan this document sure is specific! Rather than outlining a General plan that has room for growth the plan is very specific and stifles any opportunities for change in the future.

I support no plan that erodes recreational use by all parties. I support no plan that segregate people in the ONSR and keeps them from enjoying their heritage in parts of the park that are meaningful to them and their families. I support no plan that limits access to areas within the park by closing roads, limiting gravel bar camping or closing river access points.

So for all of these reasons and to protect my children's personal heritage I only support the option of NO CHANGE to the current GMP.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	798	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,17,2014 13:12:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I was raised and lived much of life here in Eminence, spent five seasons as a seasonal park ranger at Alley Springs (1972 thru 1976) and have hunted, fished and horse-backed most of Jacks Forks and Current River (above Log Yard). I have read the management plan and also the input from the folks who are pushing the planned changes with their "documented violations" of the original NPS policies on new buildings along the river, erosion, and horse and vehicle traffic near the rivers. Personally I think the NPS has, up to this point, not done a bad job with the resources they have in preserving our rivers and providing for the many types of recreation and use our area receives. (However, the old state parks could use more maintenance and clearing around spring branches, but understand, don't agree with, the desire to let things be "natural", i.e. over grown with brush and weeds).

But....I do not agree we need a new management plan with more road closures, horse back trail closures, nor new boat motor limits. The ONSR superintendent said at the meeting in Eminence last night to not just say we didn't like something, but to offer alternatives. Well...doing nothing different IS an alternative to any problem, and in my years

of experience, it is many times the best alternative. Sometimes changes cause more problems than they solve...I believe this is the case here, as I believe the NPS will discover down the road if the proposed changes are made.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 799    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 14:02:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep the park as it is. NO CHANGES

---

**Correspondence ID:** 800    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 14:49:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a Shannon County native and someone who grew up on the river, I support Alternative B. My only reservation with B is the non-motorized section above Pulltite. Not a lot of people gig in that stretch, but it means a lot to the families that do. It wouldn't cause an environmental impact because of the low number of boats and restrictions on HP.

Our family has always supported the Park Service and think Bill Black and staff have done a good job in this plan accomadating both the local Boat/ATV/Leave us Alone Club and the Environmental Extremist from St. Louis.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 801    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 15:25:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I fully support a new GMP for the Ozark Riverways and am inclined to favor Alternative B. Having a better managed park would actually improve tourism in the area, not hinder it. I would also like to see more living history exhibits and the development of several small museums to preserve the areas cultural and natural history.

I am, however disappointed that the NPS allowed two unscheduled meetings, at the very last minute, to be held in Salem and Eminence. The Riverways are National Parks and visitors come from all over the world to enjoy it and spend their money locally. Why not have a meeting in Springfield or Columbia? There are many people from Southwest Missouri that love and use those rivers who feel shafted by the process.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 802    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 15:36:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** A few years ago in Great Smoky Mountains NP we came across this NPS Mission Statement: The National Park System was established to preserve vignettes of primitive America. That probably is not verbatim, but that is the point of it.  
The NPS properties were ABSOLUTELY NOT established to boost local economies. The NPS properties were not intended to be theme parks. The properties were meant to be quiet places for hiking, paddling, camping, birding and just enjoying solitude. In our opinion outboard motors and 4-wheelers should not be allowed on the property. No more canoe concessions should be established and existing concessions should not be allowed to grow. The only way to do that is to establish and enforce a daily maximum quota of boats. Better yet, boat numbers should be scaled back over time. You know how a Summer weekend on the river is, and the screaming, drunken, trash-throwing parties are not part of the mission of the NPS. Also, horse traffic should not be allowed to expand because the erosion, pollution, dogs, and trash that goes along with horses is not part of the mission.  
Thank you for hearing us out.  
My wife and I definitely support Alternative A!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 803    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 15:45:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe a mix of Alternative A and C, but not B. The upper stretches of both the Current and Jacks Fork should be as wild and undeveloped as possible (like A). No motors, limited access, gravel bar camping only.

Leave the lower stretch (below two rivers) to the boaters and party crowd (like Alt C).

---

**Correspondence ID:** 804 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 15:57:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Having spent many great days on the Ozark waterways, I'd like to include my voice in the mix re: the GMP. The waterways should continue to be a NATIONAL treasure, to be protected for future generations of visitors and wildlife. The National Park Service should continue to operate and protect, as it has all these years, without interference from forces that might disrupt this beautiful gift of nature. To this end, I would suggest Alternative B, to also include more hiking trails, and a limit on horse parks. Thank you for your time. Dave Romea

---

**Correspondence ID:** 805 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 17:23:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I don't think anything should be done with the river. It was fine before y'all got here, and it'll be just fine when you go away. We shouldn't be the ones to pay the price for what the tourists are doing. WE pick up THEIR trash. WE deal with THEM when THEY show up drunk at OUR camp sites. Last summer we had a couple from Illinois show up and try to have SEX in front of multiple children in broad daylight, there were none of your 'rangers' around then to write any tickets but they were very insistant that we only have ONE tent and ONE camper per campsite even if the site was plenty big enough for TWO campers. We pick up our trash when we leave, and if there is any trash there when we arrive, we pick that up too.

Restricting the boating because someones canoe might get flipped over is stupid, if that's why this is happening I would be just as happy to stand in the river and flip them by hand, I don't like those people anyway!

The rocks blocking the gravel bars prevent the physically handicapped from being able to enjoy the river as well. This is not right. We were born here, we have just as much right as any out of stater, yet we are always the ones punished for their mistakes, for their actions, and for their crimes.

The worst thing to happen to Missouri in years is when the Park Service took over the campgrounds. You take the FUN out of camping. You should just leave. If you're worried about people loosing their jobs, then maybe you should hand them over to the State Department and let them sort out the good from the bad?!

People will be people, there is no way to stop their bad behaviors with restrictions that cause them to want to act out even worse. You would take all of our RIGHTS, all of our POWER and give it to someone who DOESN'T pay our taxes, who has nothing to do with our parks getting better, only worse. WHY?!

They say punishment should fit the crime, and that the person punished for the crime should be the one who COMMITS the crime. What gives YOU the rights to take away OURS?? What do you see when you look at this place? Do you even care about what WE THE PEOPLE have to say? Or would you rather sit in a plush office removed from the world like the President, and make descisions about something you don't even know or understand about??

---

**Correspondence ID:** 806 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 17:23:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I think this is wrong it feels like we are being punished for the city people that come and destroy the area. They trash the area and are mostly the drunks on the river.

The jet boats dont hurt the river I have never saw a jet boat that was run in a bad manor around the canoes and kayacks on the river for the most part the people in them will help others. I have a boat and we have helped several people that have had problems.

For the camping they are trying to limit the areas in lots of the campgrounds where they could have more sites. There is a problem with the number of workers they have way to many now to do the same job that a few years back whenn ther were more campers and only one lady to do all of the cleaning, taking out trash, and maintaing the area.

Now they have one person to do each job. I see a lot of city people on the river and camping most leave there campsites trashy and we pick up there trash to keep the place like it should be. I have camped for fourty years there. I dont like the fact of the rocks being placed at the places they are it is discrimination against handicapped. I work with them and now they cant go to the places where they grew up and swim or enjoy the water. I have said things to other nps staff about this they said to take them to other places they like the same places they go because there is not a lot of tourist there. I think it is BULLSHIT!

I feel the NPS is very rude when you see them out and hateful. They have maybe a handful of rangers that will be civil towards the public the rest have a god complex just because they have a gun do give them the right to talk to people like I have heard them do first hand.

I would like to see it left alone with some of the rocks removed and make some of the campground larger. They say they have no money but wont try to make more campgrounds available to the public in the places where needed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 807 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 17:39:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I congratulate you on the draft of the GMP, which reflects careful study and speaks to the purposes of the beautiful Scenic Riverway. I spent many delightful days on the Current River when I and my family were younger. However, we have not been there since it became an ATV playland and the waters a cesspool at times from horse manure.

I support Alternative A in the plan, especially since many of the good features of Alternative B require additional funding that may not be available. I believe the top priority should be halting the degradation of the rivers by inappropriate use and overuse and restoration of damaged areas. ( We don't allow livestock in our private lake because we don't want to swim in their feces! How complicated is that?)Motorized vehicles, boats or ATV's, destroy the solitude of the riverway as well as the terrain.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 808 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 18:09:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in full support of protecting these water ways from destructive entities and destructive plans that may inhibit the preservation of the ozark scenic riverways. I am in support of the plan that best supports responsible use of these riverways with minimal human impact. thank you for your time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 809 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 18:12:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The NPS doesn't enforce its own laws right now what good is it going to add more. A lot of problems on the river can be traced back to alcohol. What about public intoxication? Isn't there a law against that. Boater or canoer a drunk that can barely stand up doesn't have any business being on the river and should be taken care of by some type of law official.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 810 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 18:12:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** would like no changes to the present plans hhappy the way it is ththankyou

---

**Correspondence ID:** 811 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 18:29:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** II oppose any new changes to the management policies concerning the ONSR that do not reduce restrictions of usage. I do not believe the Federal Government can properly manage this area, I believe this area should be returned to the citizens of Missouri to be managed by the Missouri Department of Conservation.

Furthermore; I do not believe the Federal Government has Constitutional authority to manage the ONSR,

For the purposes of the GMP, I require NO CHANGES.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 812 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 18:39:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The meeting held in Salem was not a meeting but a show of information. No one had the opportunity to speak. It was a huge disorganized free for all to check the box of a public meeting held.

First we must vote no change because there is no acceptable option for me to ride horses or fish.

Second how can you propose miles of trails to close or designate and not provide any horse trails on any map. Very unprofessional work.

Third we do not want the trails on the upper end ruined like many others have been. Public guidance says no unnecessary material will be removed, no more than 8 feet wide, and no foreign material to be introduced. We love our timber trails and want them to be left natural.

Finally if pollution is the driving force behind this why are there no toilets proposed for canoe people when 90% of the pollution in the river is human?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 813 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 20:40:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Concerning the ONSR Draft General Management Plan please accept my support of Alternative B as the best management option going forward. I enjoy canoeing on the Current and other Missouri rivers every year. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 814 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 21:10:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The river and its surrounding ground should remain open to the people, especially the locals. Horseback riders and local canoers want the river and its surroundings kept open for its use, recreation, and enjoyment. Locals are the stewards of the river and their rights should not suffer. I have a hard time trusting anyone who barricades the river during the gov. shut down, or making churches have a permit to baptize in the river. (I understand this is no longer the case.) WHICH BRINGS ME TO ALTERNATIVE A. This looks like a plan the sierra club would like to see take place. People who may use the river once in a while or may never see the Ozarks. Unlike the locals who live here. ALTERNATIVE C looks as if the locals and local business might have been taken into consideration but still infringes upon our use of the river and forest. ALTERNATIVE B looks as if your riding the fence between big money (sierra club) and the locals who live here and some that make a living from the river. The only one any of these alternatives are infringing on is the local people who use the horse trails, gravel bars, motors on their boat for gigging etc. The reason you give for limiting these activities does not make much sense to us who live here, for instance the horse poop and the erosion. Animals (DEER, COYOTE, BEAR, CATS, THE ELK THAT WAS BROUGHT HERE, ETC. move about disturb the soil and also use the river as a rest room. I COULD GO ON AND ON BUT I'VE RUN OUT OF ROOM. I believe the locals need to play a larger role in your plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 815 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 22:38:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To those concerned taking comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan/ Wilderness Study/ EIS:  
I would like to thank the National Park Service for doing such a good job with the Draft GMP for the ONSR. Your recommended Alternative B would be a positive step forward from the status quo. With my experience having relatives in the area and having visited these rivers for 50 years, I would have to recommend Alternative A, since it provides better protections for sustainable future use of the rivers. This option would close illegal roads restoring 50 miles to nature, close 65 miles of undesignated horse trails with no new stream crossings and bar all recreational

vehicle access to gravel bars.

This park was originally created for people to enjoy the unique natural springs, caves and entire river ecosystem, not to have an amusement park ride. Moving away from this original purpose over the years has been detrimental to life on the river. There is much more noise, scenic disturbance and even development. The park wasn't meant to provide for ATV's and trucks that tear up gravel bars and ground along the rivers. Nor was it meant for noisy motorboats to zip by swimmers disturbing the peace and endangering their safety. It wasn't meant for thousands of horses to criss-cross the rivers leaving feces that also threatens swimmers with E. Coli contamination. All this with the proliferation of illegal access roads, ten times what there was supposed to be, has caused erosion, which smothers the insects in the river bed which feed the animals on up the food chain. It also causes invasion of alien species which can eventually ruin the unique web of life.

Seeing evidence of all these things getting worse led me to stay away from the rivers starting over 30 years ago. Now I may go during the week in the Spring or Fall, so I can experience the tranquility, fresh air, clean water, beauty and rejuvenation that should be available all year round. For several years my family camped at Shawnee Creek, across from which relatives grew up over 80 years ago. In recent years I've seen this area closed to recreation due to E. Coli, from the horses. There should be a horse use and trail management plan relocating trails away from the river, avoiding sensitive areas and providing park permits for horse use. There should not be a horse camp along or near the river. The dirty water reportedly draining from the River's Edge Resort should be addressed. There should be environmentally sound waste systems. What happens in and around Eminence's river banks should be monitored closely and limited when inappropriate, because it affects life downstream in a national park. I used to find an entire gravel bar covered with empty snail shells. Now I find tiny aquatic creatures less abundant, trampled by people, horses, vehicles and even bulldozers scooping up parts of the beach. I used to see many fish and other animals natural to the area and green vegetation in and alongside the rivers. Now I see less of these living things and many more campsites and several buildings that shouldn't be in the park, in violation of scenic easements.

I know from my own family that these rivers are very important to the people of the area, economically and culturally. The way the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers can continue to support future generations sustainably is by not overusing, abusing and destroying it bit by bit, but by preserving it. 15 miles or more of illegal roads and trails should go back to nature and be narrowed to hiking trails. As much of the Big Spring area as possible should be designated as wilderness. Programs and facilities providing educational experiences about natural and cultural history would bring understanding to help people responsibly care for the rivers, and possibly bring in additional needed revenue. Increased staff for both education and law enforcement at ONSR should be a priority.

Thank you for considering my comments.  
Patty Brown

---

**Correspondence ID:** 816    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,18,2014 07:17:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Shame on the Parks Department.  
The Bible says :a bribe debases the heart"  
How far is the Parks Dept. debasing itself for the Sierra Club?  
Betraying the citizen of the Ozarks for money, you must be proud.

I oppose the new management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 817    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,18,2014 07:22:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the new management plan.

Why did you call for public meetings when you didn't want to hear from them.



How much money did the Sierra Club shove in your pocket?

Your an embarrassment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 818 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,18,2014 08:33:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The National Scenic Riverways project is a vital part of Missouri outdoors. I understand its maintenance is complicated, as there are many conflicting interests. The rivers are fragile and often abused and over-used by visitors. I support your Plan B as a compromise that at least holds the line against over-control by commercial interests. You must know that there are many other Missouri outdoors folk who use and appreciate the National Scenic Riverways boating, hiking, and camping opportunities. Please protect them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 819 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,18,2014 08:57:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of Alternative B of the ONSR Draft General Management Plan.

My understanding is that motorized intrusions would be curtailed by closing undesignated roads and access points and restricting ATV traffic.

Equestrian use would be reduced by closing undesignated trails and river crossings.

Visitor areas and additional camping areas would be enhanced.

Management would be improved on the crowded and overused areas of the river.

The plan would bring the Riverways up to National Park Service standards.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 820 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,18,2014 11:40:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** You have got to be kidding how many millions of dollars did you spend on this. You leave loop holes all through this to take private land, control how we as private citizens access national forest from our land.

You seem to want everything to go back to native or natural with nothing but horse and foot traffic, how are moblie limited people as my self supposed to be able hunt and just enjoy the wild if we cant use a truck or four wheeler to get around , I cant ride a horse nor do I own one,

This totally nuts

Just ban alcohol from the river way and forget this none sense. That alone will reduce the water traffic by 50% t 75%.

I would like a copy of the proposal plan sent to me please . I believe I am entitled to that by law. I wait for its delivery, thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 821 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,18,2014 12:00:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Attn:Superintendent,

We are in favor of Alternative A were visitors experience a quieter less crowded and slow pace to enjoy nature and the beauty it has to offer all of us. We are in favor to reduce vehicles and horse riders by closing some roads and river access. All of us need to realize we are visitors to these ecosystems in the parks were plants and animals live. In your plan there is only one invasive species removal in the Ozark region were in other National Parks in the mid-west have focused on more than one invasive species removal. We believe removing of invasive species should be a top priority for the National Ozark Scenic Riverways.

Most Sincerely,  
Rose and Mike Schulte

---

**Correspondence ID:** 822    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,18,2014 13:53:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I understand limiting motorized vehicles on gravel bars and horstrails crossing the rivers. There is no way u are going to keep me or my family from accessing the rivers. Fishing, gigging and camping has been a tradition in my family for over a century. My grand father paul martin taught ray hastings the art of gig making through the ozark haritage program. Do the right thing and allow access to our rivers

---

**Correspondence ID:** 823    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,18,2014 14:04:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of Alternative A in your draft GMP for Ozark Scenic Riverways for the following reasons: 1) I support a plan with minimal impact on the natural environment with reasonable levels of public access; 2) I support the closing of illegal roads and restoring natural conditions to as many of these roads as possible; 3) I am concerned about the impact of increased horse traffic in the river on water quality, and am in favor of closing undesignated horse trails; 4) I am also in favor of a permitting process for horse traffic that would limit the numbers of people on horseback in the riverways at any one time to a number that minimizes their impact on the river; 5) I am in favor of closing all gravel bars to motorized vehicles; 6) I am in favor of wilderness status for the area around Big Spring; 7) I am in favor of increased enforcement of the rules and guidelines protecting the Scenic Riverways from damaging environmental impact.

I thank the National Park Service for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis of the issues involve, and strongly advocate for Alternative A. As an owner of land bordering the Scenic Riverways near Jam Up Cave on the Jacks Fork for the past 30 years, I have seen the impact of increased use of the river in terms of trash left behind, algae blooms that may or may not be connected to increased horse traffic upstream, and in general a loss of the sense of solitude and isolation on the river that makes it special. I would not want to see any plan adopted by the Park Service jeopardize the unique tranquility of the area for the sake of increased public traffic.

Thank you for taking my comments into account.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 824    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,18,2014 19:01:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am truly disgusted that we are having to go through this tyranny again. This all began in the 60's for my family. My Grandfather, my Dad and my Brother owned property that was taken from them. Yes I said, was taken. They were NOT given what the land was worth. At this time my Dad was going through larynx cancer at 55 years old. He lost his voice to this horrible disease and at the same time he was dealing with the NPS stealing his land. I wonder how some of you would feel if you were put in the same situation. You would be as troubled as my family and my friends are that we are still, after all these years trying to protect our rights and our heritage. Yes, I know you are tired of hearing about every ones heritage but if you had lived your life on this beautiful piece of Gods Creation you would be feeling the same.

Another thing that has troubled me all these years, is the fact that the NPS razed the Old Cardareva School, what was that all about? I actually attended school there as well as 3 of my other siblings. I thought the NPS was all about preservation. Today there is a High \$ toilet sitting in that very location. How disgusting!!!

Why is the Sierra Club's opinion so much more important than the local people. They need to stay in the big city's and leave us alone. I am not sure the NPS realizes how ugly this situation could get if this is not stopped soon. Yes, there are a bunch of crazy hillbillys that live in the areas where the NPs is trying to make these changes.

We love and take care of our areas very well. We have river clean ups often and things like that to help keep our shorelines and river bottoms clean. Honestly some of the vistsors leave messes that we clean up. Their have been lives saved because of the boaters. The fight is not over.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 825    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,18,2014 20:31:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like the waterways to stay the same that they have for as long as i can remember. We have been coming to Eminence horse back riding for 20 years. We just bought land there this last year. Hoping to retire there and ride horses till we can no longer ride. We love it there. We love the river and are glad it is taken care of. We want the trails left open,please. There is only afew weeks a year that there are a lot of usage of the trails. Most of the time it is quiet and peaceful. I think the river erases the damage that is done by anyone every season that it floods it does more damage to itself and the environment around it. The local businesses would really suffer if the horse riding stopped. Please keep the trails open.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 826 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,18,2014 20:32:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like the waterways to stay the same that they have for as long as i can remember. We have been coming to Eminence horse back riding for 20 years. We just bought land there this last year. Hoping to retire there and ride horses till we can no longer ride. We love it there. We love the river and are glad it is taken care of. We want the trails left open,please. There is only afew weeks a year that there are a lot of usage of the trails. Most of the time it is quiet and peaceful. I think the river erases the damage that is done by anyone every season that it floods it does more damage to itself and the environment around it. The local businesses would really suffer if the horse riding stopped. Please keep the trails open.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 827 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,18,2014 22:23:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please leave the current and jacks fork rivers alone. Your proposed plans are redicilious. The conservation department could do a better job at managing the areas. You are effecting the livelyhood of the people who live in this area. STAY OUT!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 828 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,19,2014 08:26:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Alternative C seems to be the best plan of the 3 presented, although none are the greatest. Seems like humans, horsemen & wildlife all benefit.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 829 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,19,2014 09:54:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Your open forum's were a joke. You have already decided what you are going to do and are just ignoring how the public feels. Apparently the ones that you want to enjoy the river are the floaters never giving much consideration to the fisherman that run motor boats or the horse people. Those people spend a lot of money in the economy, plus most of them are locals who live them, support the local businessmen daily versus a group of floaters that come from the city and spend one or two days on the river. Well, you are probably going to get your wish and I am sure you are going to have to hire many more park employees to clean up all of the trash and toilet paper they leave along the river. We see it every time we ride. We pay taxes, a lot of taxes for government land use that we eventually are going to be forced out of. If it is not broken, don't fix it but apparently you government officials see a different way. Just remember the ones you force out of there, pay taxes too so you can enjoy your paycheck.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 830 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,19,2014 11:31:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please manage the river according to Alternative A. I prefer nonmotorized use of as much of the river as possible. That is why I go to the river - to experience nature, not to hear/see and experience the effects of motorized uses. I have treasured the Current and Jacks Fork for over 60 years and they are dear to my heart, as they are to many people in this whole country. Please preserve the rivers and lands bordering them in as close to natural and native condition as possible. I am also concerned for the water quality - the essence of the river. It must be preserved also. I especially do not approve of private horse rental businesses profiting off the river, while fouling it

at the same time. I appreciate the many concerns that the NPS faces, and appreciate the agency's protection - and rely on it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 831    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,19,2014 16:21:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I was introduced to the Jack's Fork and Current River in 2009 through an organized trail ride...The Cross Country Trail Ride. My daughter, grand daughter and I camped at Eminence Missouri for 4 days and we literally fell in love with the area. The waterway was so clean and the trails maintained...trash cans at popular places. I must say when we returned home we started straight away planning for the next year, and have been going to the week long rides every since.

When we were asked about our ride and the area, we always commented the same thing...."sure wish our Forest was that clean" and "it's absolutely gorgeous riding".

As a visitor to your State I ask that all options be considered to the fullest and choose the one that best serves the State, County and the People of Eminence and surrounding towns that benefit from the tourism.

We've grown to love the area and really hate the thought of not being able to enjoy it with our family and equine.

Holly Stokich  
Galatia, IL 62935

---

**Correspondence ID:** 832    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,19,2014 18:41:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** For the last 30 years, my husband and I, along with our family have been enjoying the beautiful Ozark National Senic Riverway. So much so we purchased 9 acres with two other couples so we can continue to enjoy the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers with our children and grandchildren. We are avid horseback riders and canoers. We demand respect for the natural beauty of the area and pass that respect onto our families. I am torn....I do understand wanting to preserve the natural beauty being effected by (ie..motorized vehicles in the river and unauthorized landings); but I don't understand local property owners having to purchase permits for access to horse trails. Yes, several times a year there are many riders on "some" of these trails. But there are many trails that only locals know about and ride. But at the same time these riders and canoers keep this town alive making it possible for locals and business owners to support their families.

There has GOT to be a solution that both sides can live with.

To touch on the ecoli in the water...mainly being directed toward horses...I don't understand. Horses eat natural foods, drink water, as do all the wildlife in the forest area, except, horses are vacinated for multiple viruses,etc. Whereas, what about the number of people floating the rivers....what do they do to contribute to the ecoli problem?

As far as trailriders... I would say that 75% o riders never ride much longer than 2 to 3 hours out and go back to their camps and alot of that is riding on the roads. Whereas the other 25% o riders are there for the riding and spend up to 8 hours out riding, riding on trails that are hardly ever seen. I do know that some trails are poorly marked making it hard to determine the true trail and even finding themselves on private property. This causes people to get lost forcing them to cross the river where normally they wouldn't or ride where they shouldn't. (ie.. creating unauthorized trails). One gets lost, creating a path....another group gets lost..following in tracks of the last and so on and so on. Creating a "new trail". Also, we have been on the river for many years and only 2 times have I seen anyone with the Park Service on the river and "never" have I seen anyone employed by the Park Service on the trails. Maybe the government should have more employees to monitor these areas.

The blame should not fall completely on the public or only the public be made to pay. We all need to accept and correct our failed responsibility to maintain the natural beauty of this area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 833 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,19,2014 19:30:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I sincerely hope that the NPS will complete its draft management plan to help secure the future of this beautiful river. A review of what has happened up to now and using this information to better manage this beautiful river is needed now.

I support the acceptance of Alternative B.

I further want to ask that part of the management plan address the terrible use of the gravel bars along the Current River as out houses. This plan needs to better educate river users to go a short distance into the woods where there is soil to defecate or urinate. This will lessen bacteria levels in the river as well as greatly reducing the number of piles of toilet paper on the gravel bars. Locals see the lack of respect by these canoeists as they leave their big cities and trash all of our rivers.

I own ATV's and I will soon be back in the horse business. Neither of these should be in the river or on gravel bars. Riffles and gravel bars help purify the river. This cannot happen when river users are abusing these sensitive areas.

I would also ask that the NPS or MDC better patrol the river. I stopped canoeing this great river due to the horrible effects of gigging. I brought a lot of friends to see this river every October. But I stopped coming in October due to unethical giggers. I am not against gigging all together, but the wanton waste of game fish by giggers needs to be better patrolled. Then add the drunks on the river, why use the river?

I own property within 100 yds of the Current River. I love this river. We all need to better protect it so our children and their children can enjoy this wild river.

Good luck with your plan review.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 834 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,19,2014 22:19:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a "local", the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers have been a major part of my life. I have many happy memories of time spent on these rivers. I have shared them with my children and hope that I will be able to share them with my grandchildren. I have spent many hours swimming, boating, floating, camping, gigging, hunting and horseback riding. No matter the weather, there is always something to do. Please do not close or limit access to the rivers. I respectfully ask that you make no changes to the management plan. The current plan is restrictive enough.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 835 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 08:03:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I wish the management plan went even further in restricting horse and motorized traffic use but this is a significant step in the right direction. Unfettered and often illegal use of the park by above groups are degrading this national treasure and need to be curtailed. It's about time the NPS stand up to those vested local interests that do not have the park's best interests in mind and restore the waterway.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 836 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 08:04:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It's beyond time to clean up the ONSR. Restrict the horses and the ATVs/ORV use and the park will be a better place for all visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 837 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 08:07:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The management plan is well past due. It is time to clean up the ONSR by restricting those

users whose recreation activities are degrading this natural beauty.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 838 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 08:09:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to comment to say that I am for no-action on the GMP because of the limitations it will put on our riverways. I am a boater and every plan you are proposing is effecting boaters on the river. This river is a recreational park. Boating is a recreation and something that treasure. It gives us the opportunity to fish, to float, to see the different beautiful areas of the river, and to simply just ride with the wind in your face! I would like to say that I am a local to the Current River and I take great care of it. We cherish it. Please consider no action to the GMP.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 839 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 08:15:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to propose that you choose no-action to the GMP. We love and cherish the time we get to spend on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. I grew up my entire life on it. Its a part of my heritage. And I want it to be a part of my children and grand children's heritage too. In this day and age, everything is technological. But not that River. Its nature in it's own state. Its a way for us to capture the simple beauty of our area. You can't get that everywhere. Its an amazing thing. I'd rather spend my weekend on that river over some big fancy trip to the city any day. There is something about hearing voices echoing from the bluffs while we camp at log yard that is just soothing to the soul. Its my home. And I hope that you won't take that from me and my family.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 840 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 08:24:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am for no action to the GMP. I live in Ellington, Missouri and our small community really relies on the river for economic reasons. Without that river, our town would lose several large businesses in the area, as well as tourists that pass through our community and spend money at our local businesses. The river is a important factor to our river. If you add further limitations to the river, you are just taking away a piece of our economy at a time. Our community can't handle that. Not only will our economy suffer, but Eminence and Van Buren's economy will suffer to an extreme amount. We need no further limitations to the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. I support No-Action to the GMP.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 841 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 08:40:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to state that I support no action to the GMP. I do so because of the amount of accesses that are said to be closed. The accesses are already extremely limited and have been closing throughout the last several years. We need accesses to the rivers so that we can enjoy the beauty of the nature of our area. I am a camper. A boater. A fisherman. A recreational friend of the Current River. I camp 4-5 times a year at the gravel bar at Cordareva Bluff. And I have been camping there since I was a baby. And even though it isn't fancy, we aren't even offered water or a trash service any more...It is a place that is very dear to my heart. We do our very best to keep the area clean and treasure it as if it was our own. If you close accesses to the riverways, who is to say you won't close that one? I can't stand by and let a place that I call home be taken from me for no reasonable purpose. Please choose no-action to the GMP. It pushes more and more limitations to our river and gives us less of a chance to experience the wonderful things it offers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 842 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 09:48:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to comment to say I support no action to the GMP because of the restrictions it will add to our river. I am a boater and any plan you offer is restricting boating abilities further. This is why I am against the GMP. Boating the Current River is extremely important to me and my heritage. I ride, I float, I swim, I fish, and I enjoy the river's beauty all because of my boating abilities. Its a necessity that we do no lose any boating abilities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 843 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 10:26:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Me and my family are against the general management plan! Our whole life we have enjoyed the river ! We aren't drinkers or partiers! We don't cause any trouble and we always pick up our mess when we leave. We have thee kids and we just like to take our family and enjoy the beautiful country and spend long summer days at powder mill!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 844 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 10:46:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am very against this! I grew up on the current and spent countless hours on the Current River. Not only do I have memories from the river, but the river taught me quite a bit about my heritiage. Not to mention that I pay taxes, and a recreational river is being taken from us. The park service wants to see "new money" but us locals are what keep business and the park service afloat in the fall and winter. Taking away what is so important to most of is locals is devastating. We have a right to be on the river we grew up on. Taking the rivers away is like taking a part us. WE NEED OUR RIVERS TO REMAIN THE WAY THEY ARE!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 845 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 10:48:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I don't understand how you can call it management of anything when you are trying to limit our use to something we pay taxes on. This is a God given river for us to enjoy and use,but also leave in good condition for future use. We don't need you to tell us how we ca do this!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 846 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 11:02:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** no change

---

**Correspondence ID:** 847 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 11:09:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This message is to state my opposition to the General Management Plan. I grew up going to Current River and sitting along the bank fishing with my Grandma (who was born, raised and now buried on Paint Rock near Current River in Shannon County), going on picnics and camping trips with my mom and family and boating with my dad. Current River is not only a beautiful area, it is a way of life for locals. I cannot imagine my 7 year old daughter growing up not being able to camp, go boating and enjoy Current River as I was so blessed to do. Our taxes pay for this park and as such, we should be allowed to continue to use it as a recreational park rather than preserve. Tourists come from far and near to see the beauty of this river and when they visit, they frequent our local restaurants, they purchase groceries, fuel and supplies from our local stores and stations, they sometimes stay overnight utilizing our local motel and bed and breakfast. This General Management Plan will not only negatively effect the lives of locals, it will greatly effect our local economy.

Sincerely,  
Susan R. Davis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 848 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 11:24:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to start by saying I dearly love our local rivers. I have been a resident of the Missouri Ozarks my entire life and have enjoyed the Current and Jacks Fork rivers since I was an infant. I have a long family heritage in this area. My great grandparents land is part of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways as well as only living a few miles from Current River myself. I hope that there are NO CHANGES to the ONSR management plan. I feel that the Riverways should be accessed for the recreation of the people who live here. The management plan should not reflect the wishes of people who do not reside here and that aren't effected daily by the

decisions that are made. My view of the National Park Service is that there job is to be caretakers of our Riverways. They are not owners. These rivers are owned by the people therefore the people should be able to access and enjoy this area now and for future generations. If the access is limited more than it currently is it is a slippery slop that ends with no access to a place that truley brings life to the area.

I would also like to say that limiting access to the OSNR will be devistating to the local economy. My grandparents previously owned a canoe rental and the river provided for them and their children just like it still does for many families in the Ozarks. These local families love and care for these national treasures. Again I want emphasis that want no changes to the current OSNR management plan as I feel any change would have a negative effect on the people that reside here.

Thanks,

Jessi Roderman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 849    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 11:30:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I retired to this area to enjoy riding my horses.I own property here & I'm vested in this area, it would be an awful mistake to close any of our trails let alone 65 miles of them,I don't understand how this could happen in the USA.Your plan doesn't indicate where this is expected to happen,when the 35 miles of trails will be done or where.I,m truley dissappointed in the park service & how the citizens of this area are being treated.It is very evident that the economy of the Ozarks is going to be devasting with this plan.Big Creek Trail Ride currently has no designated trails & it would be a huge mistake to harm the family owned bussiness of the Howell family, this is how these people live & give back to our area.To charge a permit fee for riding horses is absolutly the wrong thing to do. What kind of message are you trying to send???People come to the Ozarks from all over the world to ride horses & vacation, at Cross Country Trail Ride, thousands of dollars are spent here during these rides,money that this area could be losing because of the changes of your plan.Eminence could literally become a ghost town due to this!!! It appears that this very well could be the intent for this town. My Father fought in WWII to protect things like this from happening to American citizens.{IS THIS HOW YOU SHOW APPRECIATION FOR OUR MILITARY VETRANS?} It is heart breaking to think our own government even thinking of doing it's people this way. THIS LAND BELONGS TO ALL THE PEOPLE, NOT JUST NPS!!! WERE IT NOT FOR THE PEOPLE YOU'RE TRYING TO HARM,you would not have the jobs you have!! Are the people outraged? You bet we are!!! I realize you have a job to do, but please get on your knees & pray that you do the RIGHT THING. Thank you for considering my heartfelt comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 850    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 11:47:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I prefer the no action plan ... People needs to be able to use the river. Not just come in and look at .. it might not be right now, but with time, that is what the NPS wants... I feel the there should be more road open up, more camp sights open up a long the river.. As far as horse power on the boats.. I feel if the hp was totally lifted, the boats would be even safer, and the boater could haul more people so there would be less boaters..

---

**Correspondence ID:** 851    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 11:55:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of the no action plan. i want the roads open to access the river. i want more camp sites open.i want the boaters hp limit left alone so i can ride safely.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 852    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 11:58:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am for the no action plan. I would like for the rivers to be even more open so we can go camping and I would like for the horsepower limit to not be cut down. I also think that all of the roads to the rivers



should stay open.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 853 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 12:01:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am for the no action plan i think that there should be more campsites open and that there should be more roads that lead to the river ways. I think that the horse power limit on boats should be raised so we can gig and fish.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 854 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 12:12:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I very much disagree and completely am against the general movement plan. The Ozarks are not just a place to go for camping trips with family that have been in many families traditions for years or even enjoying the beauty of the rivers, but for many small town people, it's our way of escaping and really enjoying the outdoors. Coming home from college - the river is one of the biggest things I look forward to! If you take that freedom away, What other "good quality fun" is there to enjoy without getting into a lot of trouble? For exampl : drinking, partying... Ect. Being outdoors on the river bank has been some of the best quality time with Jesus I've ever had. It's a place I can go to really clear my mind and get away from the world and all of it's distractions! I love the river and I will stand up for our freedom and fight for the beauty and land that God has created for "us" to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 855 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 12:24:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Ozark National Scenic riverway is a way of life in this area. It has always been and should always be open to the public. This area alone brings in tourist from all over the world. I personally have met people from California, Nevada & even Germany that have traveled to this area specifically because of the beauty of our river. We pay taxes for the upkeep of our river area. If we no longer have access to the river, are we therefore not going to have to pay taxes for the upkeep?? I think that would be logical. I would rather pay taxes and have access to the only recreational activitie that is available to the people of this area. It's not like we can drive 20 minutes and be somewhere where we would be able to do something. We are a very rural and poverty stricken area. Most people in this area do nothing but go to the river because they cannot afford to do anything else. I think blocking access to the river is wrong in every aspect of the word.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 856 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 14:27:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am adamantly against the GMP. Please do not add restrictions to the rivers that we currently enjoy and have enjoyed for decades. We work hard and pay taxes that make these rivers available to the public. This is part of our heritage and I would hate for future generations to not be able to enjoy these beautiful rivers. The residents and taxpayers of Southern Missouri have enjoyed these natural resources for years and I hope we will be able to continue to do so without these adverse restrictions that are being pushed onto us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 857 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 14:29:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Letting you know that I am against the General Management Plan. My reasons are as follows:

I was raised close to the Current River. My husband and I own a cabin there and we have thoroughly enjoyed many years of boating, swimming, and all other recreational activities available. Our Heritage is an extremely important part of our lives. Yes, the Park Service is helping to preserve that. But to what avail if we are not able to enjoy what we once had.

I don't feel there is anything wrong with the way the Park is being managed thus far. Yes there are some who do things they shouldn't. They definitely can't all be locals. I'm sure that happens in all National Parks. The locals are the ones that gave up the area for this National Park, and thus they deserve to be able to use them as before. As they

are managed now the tourism is a help to our economic growth.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 858    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 14:58:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My comments are somewhat related to the fact that I worked at Big Spring when it was still a state park in 1960's as park naturalist. During that time I visited, either because of work or just went to them, other state parks that eventually came under the NPS. I have ever since supported the idea of the need to keep the Current River and its related natural features preserved for future generations and to not have it changed into a lake of somesort. I continue to feel that way and that is why whenever I'm in the area. And after my retirement from Missouri State Parks after 43 years, I still go by and look at the areas I either worked in or am familiar with. I believe that the park service is going, generally speaking, the best job that it can do, considering that I believe that the park is in fact short of the number of staff it needs to handle the large volume of people who annually use it, especially from an inforcement standpoint in the warmer times of the year and I certainly would like to more interpreters available to explain the resouces to park visitors.

However, some of the comments that get back to me, make me wonder where certain individuals are coming from who live in the area. I beleve that they have tended to put their own personel thoughts ( sometimes very narrow ) toward a very narrow perspective and have at times not looked at the big picture and then tried to narrow down the many sub topics that make up the big picture of the area and the resources. Granted the many sub topics need to be looked at, but they must be considered in the bigger picture of the whole region of the state that the Current River flows through.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 859    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 15:39:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My heritage and culture in this area goes back several generations. It is almost incomprehensable to me how the government can justify denying any citizen the right to enjoy what we all have. I ask you: If we cannot enjoy these natural areas, what good are they? I am a landowner in this area.

I served in the Marine Corps. At the time that I was in it was constantly said that we were preserving our way of life. Well, here we find ourselves in a battle right in our own backyards with a government that seems to believe it is acceptable to begin restricting people from areas that they have been going to and sports that they have been participating in for generations. What a sham. What a disgrace this is to the American people.

I have spent many hours in the wilderness areas. I have not one time seen an ATV or vehicle of any kind off of the roads unless they were lawfully cutting timber. Now what could be the logic restricting 4 wheelers from traveling these old logging roads in the future? It's ridiculous.

I own and ride horses often. Some days my family might go for a ride at the spur of a moment. And now part of these plans mandate applying way ahead of time to ride a horse through areas I have been riding for years? This is another example of socialism. Applying for a permit months or even years ahead of time to ride a horse through public land? i just cannot make sense of this.

Restricting parts of the rivers to boats is another issue. It just makes no sense to tell people that they can't take their grandkids by boat to fish or to swim where their grandparents or parents took them.

My Grandfather, my father, and I all served this country. For what? So the government can restrict or deny our offspring of their culture and heritage? It is a sad day in this nation that this is taking place.

Now I have gone back and looked at the law that set this land aside. This 1964 law was just over 2 pages long. I have also read these proposals. All 534 pages. Just this alone speaks of the injustice. I see this law setting aside land to keep it from being commercialized and developed so the public could enjoy this for years to come. Not what I see going on here.

I believe that we need a conversation. A conversation on how we can all open more trails and roads. Get more recreation here. Whatever it takes so more people can enjoy this area. Not restrict it. Let's work to find ways that we

can get more families here enjoying what God has given us. Special Interest organizations need not control this conversation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 860 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 18:14:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This plan infringes on my heritage. My family has always took part in camping, fishing, and boating on the Current River. A great deal of my childhood was spent on this river, and this plan would limit me from being able to do the same with my children.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 861 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 19:47:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I live on land that borders the Ozark Scenic Riverways below Blue Springs. I spend a lot of time fishing, swimming and canoeing the Jacks fork as well as picking up trash from the river while I am there. After reviewing the proposals I would prefer alternative A. I am completely opposed to the commercial horse operations on the lower Jacks and I don't float down that far because it is pretty trashed in some sections below Eminence. The bunch that supports motorized use, ATV use and horse use seem arrogant and don't really care to enjoy the rivers in their pristine states. There used to be a crossing not too far from where I live and people used to drive their 4x4 trucks through the river and then leave their trash on the gravel bar. This is the bunch that wants to keep traditional use, traditional disrespect that is. Keep this land Federal! State control of this land would just allow local politicians to take away the protection of these precious resources. These lands need to be kept safe for future generations. Thank you. Timothy Wilson.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 862 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 20:21:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment. I think the NPS preferred alternative B seems to be reasonable; but please be advised that the continuation of traditional uses, such as fishing with hunting and trapping be allowed as stated in the Wildlife Code of Missouri and be protected within the park. I do hunt and fish and I love to trap so I am very concern that these things be allowed to continue in our parks. Again thanks for allowing me to voice my opinion.

Sincerely, Paul Webb Treasurer Of The Missouri Trappers Assoc.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 863 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 21:25:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service,

As the Co-Chairman of one of the largest property rights organizations in Southern Missouri I continue to be taken aback by the tactics and activities of the National Park Service. Our organization has been very active in voicing our concerns about the continued abuse of power by federal agencies. The Park Service has been involved in the outrageous National Heritage Area effort that many of us were able to expose and stop. We also have worked to expose and stop the National Blueways that was put in place over the Southern third of Missouri totally under the radar of our elected officials and the concerned landowners and citizens in the great White River watershed region. That effort was exposed and the land control agenda of the Park Service was stopped thankfully. By the way, the National Park Service did nothing to educate the people about that effort or the Heritage Area debacle. Sadly, this expanding management plan is another effort to gain more control of our region and adversely affect our economy and our property rights.

I personally own over 600 acres in Texas and Shannon County. I have done all I can to protect my right to use my property and continue to be greatly concerned by the regulations that the Park Service has been a part of in the past on these other issues, and have read the memorandums of understanding the Park Service has with other federal agencies. These agreements the Park Service has made will continue to implement land restrictions and regulations not only on Park Service lands but also regulations that will impact adjoining land owners.

I strongly oppose any further restrictions and closings of trails and roads. As a matter of fact, I believe the Park Service can no longer be trusted in Missouri and it is my desire that the land the Park Service manages would be turned back to the great State of Missouri. Our members and coalition partners number in the thousands. I personally have not heard ANY of them desire more control and more restrictions. As a matter of fact, they want less.

I have been a part of the rulemaking process for many years and believe it is completely wrong. Elected officials should be making these decisions NOT the agencies hired hands. This is an affront to our Constitutional process and there seems to be no limit to the abuses this type of process has created.

Wise and multiple use is what we need on our rivers. Sound science, NOT whatever some agency "expert" claims to be his version of the truth. I am still asking for the science of the endangered species listing of the Ozarks Hellbender. Can you please send me information on how that was decided? Our streams are choked with gravel that has destroyed habitat for our fish and other critters. It is YOUR policies that have helped lead to this destruction by tying the hands of landowners and gravel miners who would love to help ease this problem.

I tried to get a chance to make some public comments at the meeting in Eminence, but was not allowed to as no one was, except one private individual.

For the record I love our land and our rivers. I love the precepts of freedom our Nation was build upon. The agenda of Federal agencies to continue to regulate us to death here in rural Missouri is sad. You say you are from the government and you are here to help. I say help us by letting us use our roads and our rivers wisely. Your continued encroachment upon our lives is not welcome.

I certainly hope for a change in the radical goals of the Park Service in their use of European land use models to control those of us that actually must make a living from the land and it's related industry.

I certainly hope you will at the very least stay with the management plan you have had in the past and improve it by reducing your regulations and stop the limiting of access and closing of roads. Your agencies conduct during the budget process was particularly horrid with blocking of our Parks to our vets and elderly. We will never forget.

Our fragile Ozarks economy is but a shadow of what it used to be. How much longer can government regulate job creators to death and print money and pay welfare and food stamps to pick up the slack. If I was a part of your agency I would be ashamed.

Not all of us can get big government checks and nice retirement packages from the government as you agency people do. As a matter of fact, it's people like me trying to actually produce something that pays your salary. In actuality, you are destroying the livelihoods of working folks who are trying to pay for this massive, overreaching government we have. I guess it would be too much to think you would get that, as it seems all government wants to do is expand it's reach and increase it's costs and burden, but still I try.

Sincerely,

Bob Parker

Co-Chairman Property Rights Coalition  
417-457-6111 or Bob@bakerealty.com  
Our website is [www.PRCnews.org](http://www.PRCnews.org)

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	864	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,20,2014 21:40:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I just finished reading of the Draft General Management Plan for the National Scenic Riverways (433 pages of text). It is a very thorough and thoughtful document; the authors should be proud of their

work.

I personally favor many of the goals of Alternative A because it promotes the wilderness concept of the Riverways more than any other alternative. However, I encourage the adoption of plan B because, in my view, it is a sensible compromise which stimulates responsible public use but still provides significant environmental protection.

Although I am an Illinois resident, our family has had a cabin near the Jack's fork River for 13 years. Along with our family and friends, we float and fish the Jack's Fork and hike extensively in the National Scenic River area. The Scenic River is an incredibly valuable natural resource.

I am also empathetic to the requests of ATV owners and horse riders for more roads and access points into the NRS. We can not get citizen support for environmental protection and for maintaining publicly held state and federal land if the public does not have access to these lands and does not appreciate them. However, we must balance the requests for the expansion of vehicular roads, horse trails, and increased use of motorized vehicles with the need to protect natural areas within NSR as well as provide people who wish to have a "wilderness experience" the opportunity to have this experience without the intrusion of motorized vehicles and horses.

Most of the public lands in Missouri (both state and federal) allow ATVs and horses so placing restrictions on how and where horses and ATVs may be used within the NSR is not unreasonable given the large tracts of public land open to ATVs and horses. The Current, Jack's Fork and Eleven Point Rivers are the only NSR designated rivers in the State of Missouri and they represent only a relatively small percentage of publicly held land in the State of Missouri. They also represent a unique ecosystem with springs, crystal clear rivers, a diverse (and often unique) assemblage of plant and animal species (especially minnows and darters). Opening the NSR to more intrusive use of ATVs and horses with the accompanying roads, degradation of sandbars, pollution of springs and rivers, and an increase of littering will irrevocably change the character of the NSRs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 865    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 21:49:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No Action Alternative

---

**Correspondence ID:** 866    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 02:49:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have always believed biking on public streets and highways is a danger and a nuisance and with the economy like it is we cannot afford to allocate funds to promote this sport.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 867    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 07:14:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in favor of the no action plan. I want more roads opened up and I enjoy hunting, fishing, camping, and gigging.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 868    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 07:23:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would prefer the non action plan. Due to the fact that I love having options and different places to go on the river. I would like to see roads remain open and new roads be built. With the new camping sights there could be more campsites and improve tourism and ad to Missouri economy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 869    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 07:24:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would prefer the non action plan. Due to the fact that I love having options and different places to go on the river. I would like to see roads remain open and new roads be built. With the new camping sights there could be more campsites and improve tourism and ad to Missouri economy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 870 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 08:02:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Leave it as is or let the missouri gov run it , the people around here love this river and take care of it , have been using this river all are lives .

---

**Correspondence ID:** 871 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 08:20:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'd like to voice my support for the Plan B option for the ONSR management plan. I'd like to see reasonable restrictions on river access/use with full enforcement of those restrictions. We need balanced management that keeps the river healthy, and full of diverse species, while providing for human recreation and economy. Otherwise, in the long run, we will loose this irreplaceable natural resource.  
Thank you,  
Mary

---

**Correspondence ID:** 872 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 08:20:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent:  
We wish that you would please consider the following:  
1)The 1964 Congressional legislation stated that the Riverways were being established for conservation, preservation and recreation. Recreation should continue to have at least equal emphasis, and in these economically trying times perhaps should be given even more.  
2)I regularly participate in these recreational activities: Boating, camping, floating, fishing. They are important to me because it allows my wife and four sons an opportunity to enjoy more wholesome things and be with nature.  
3)The primary areas I use are Log yard, Cordareva and Powder Mill.  
4)I would like to see more done to preserve the traditional culture that was here prior to 1964.  
5)Alternative B that the ONSR is proposing unnecessarily adds further restrictions with little or no empirical data for a basis. A more visible and active presence of Park Rangers along with broader resource based recreational zones would better address the growing number of visitors.  
6)Any and all bans on motorized watercraft should be eliminated from whatever General Management Plan is adopted. In fact, present restrictions should be reviewed as to their necessity. The river reasonably regulates itself as to motor size and times of usage. Those parties creating a specific safety hazard should be addressed individually under the multitude of present laws.  
7)I applaud the decision to recognize 60/40 as 40 HP and wish that they continue to recognize 40/25's as 25 HP.  
8)I wish that the NPS would do a better job of maintaining our access to the river, given the elderly and the disabled that are wholly dependent upon such physical accesses.  
9)I wish that the staff of the ONSR would increase their efforts to reach out to horse and boat owners to increase their usage and resolve whatever conflicts might actually exist.  
10)I believe the GMP as presently put forth exceeds the scope of policy and is actually prescribing regulations, and doing that somewhat ambiguously.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 873 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 08:23:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I WOULD LIKE TO SEE NO CHANGE TO CURRENT PLAN. I ENJOY THE RIVERWAYS THE WAY THEY ARE AND SEE NO REASON FOR CHANGE. IF THERE IS CHANGE JUST THINK ABOUT THE HARDSHIP IT WOULD PUT ON THE CANOE RENTALS, MOTELS, RESTAURANTS, GROCERY STORES ETC. THIS LIST GOES ON AND ON OF THE PEOPLE THIS WOULD EFFECT. PLEASE DON'T CHANGE OUR RIVERWAYS. PLEASE LET MISSOURI TAKE CARE OF THEIR RIVERWAYS.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 874 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 09:17:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Alt B with a few suggestions:

- Cooperation with volunteer groups to do more living history
  - Allow motorized use above Pulltite
  - Bring back jon boat rides at Big Springs
  - A long hiking trail somewhere on the upper Jacks Fork - maybe Bay Creek to Alley or 17 bridge to Reymers
  - Encourage more value-added recreation (fishing/river guiding, historical canoe tours, commissary boats, etc.)
- A better managed park, in the long run, will be much better for the local economy. River guides in most National Parks earn over \$200 a day!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 875 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 12:06:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a resident of Ozark County. Even though I do not live in the area of the National Scenic Riverways NP, I still love the area and have floated and camped along both the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers. I love the area and feel very strongly that it should be protected and preserved for future generations to enjoy.

I am also aware that there are many commercial interests and property rights folks who are against any restrictions on the use of the rivers. I myself, own property on the Bryant Creek. I see unprotected uses along the creek that harm the natural environment because Bryant Creek is not protected.

I favor Alternative B and believe it is the best combination of protection and recreational use. I am in favor of limitations on uses such as 4-wheeler activities and any gravel mining along tributaries. The silt caused by such activities makes its way into the NP areas. Such uses should be restricted.

I have been the President of the Ozarks Resource Center (an environmental protection group) in this area. I feel very strongly that the natural environment is an important resource and must not be destroyed.

Sincerely,

Jay Dee Martin, Ph.D.

Retired Economics Professor

---

**Correspondence ID:** 876 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 12:41:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My comment is two fold. I have my personal point of view and a business point of view. As on Office holder for Shannon County I can see the changes in the managment plan being a great detriment to the people of Shannon County. A large portion of the the people in Shannon County, especially the Eminence area make their living from the tourists. When you limit access to the rivers more than what you already have this limits the amount of money to be made by the businesses in this town. More restrictions and shut downs will close the doors to many more businesses in our area. More than what have already had to close due to the economic crisis. Those organizations that are pushing the OSNR to regulate have no concept of the "living" the day to day lives in this area. They don't care what we have to deal with. They are trying to pay their way to getting what they want strictly because they can afford it! With no other understanding to the real issues at hand. There are other ways to fix the problems "they" seem to think we have down here, without shutting things down. The information as to the river, the roads, etc. is being misrepresented. Like the erosion??? What a load of crap. Instead of doing these little private studies that the decisions are being made from, maybe an open study with input from the locals might shed some light as to the real problems and what can be fixed.

I also have a personal stake in this decision. My family and I go to the river almost every weekend in the summer. We use the river as a family fun day as much as time and circumstances allow. There is no way I would do anything that would cause the shutdown of the river. Same as most all locals in the area. We love the river too. Just like the people that want it shut down claim to do. The difference is I don't expect to get to keep it all to myself. The people

pushing for the shutdown think "they" should be able to come whenever they want and not find anyone else enjoying the river. If they want a pristine, silent place to enjoy the scenery maybe they could stay at home and go to one of the parks in their own area. I have no doubt it is pristine, unpopulated and perfect. As I'm sure they have already swept their own doorstep before they came to sweep mine. And if they do decide to come the Jacks Fork or Current River, then they should understand, other people love the river too!

Please consider all the lives that will be effected in a negative way before you choose to do this shutdown. Leave things alone. Enforce the laws you already have and let the people live to enjoy the river for years to come!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 877 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 13:06:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like NO ACTION on the Ozark National Scenic Riverway management plan.

I have read the entire 543 page document, and am OPPOSED to the three alternative action plans described. I do not like the idea of "management zoning." I am opposed to implementing "visitor use management strategies" which will be used to further control visitor access, use and behavior.

I am opposed to the idea of organizing a park advocacy group, which would put unelected and unaccountable persons in the decision-making process that affect Missourians' and visitors' recreational experiences. I believe the concerns outlined in the document can best be addressed through local means, not through federal regulation.

Overall, I am opposed to the increased regulation, restrictions on access, permit fees and requirements, and other onerous ideas/proposals outlined in the three action alternatives.

Sincerely,  
Erin Talcott

---

**Correspondence ID:** 878 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 13:34:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a lifelong Missourian, nature and outdoor activity enthusiast with three generations of Eagle Scouts in my immediate family, I would like to voice my comment on the Ozark National Scenic Riverway mangagement plan.

I would like to see NO ACTION taken on this plan.

I oppose the three alternative action proposals for a variety of reasons- -primarily because I believe control of our state's natural resources needs to be local. I am opposed to the idea of managment zoning, implementation of visitor use management strategies, organizing a park advocacy group and other ideas in the management plan. The action alternatives in the plan impose increased regulations, restrict access, impose permit requirements and fees, and are a means to further regulate Missouri taxpayers, who should be able to enjoy the natural resources they pay for without burdensome regulation and fees. Controlling negative visitor behavior should be left to local control. We do not want unelected and unaccountable persons "advocating" and regulating our natural resources, closing roads, setting up permit systems for horse use, etc. for Missourians. NO ACTION on this plan is best. Thanks. Michael Talcott.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 879 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 14:01:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am sending this comment to inform you that we do not want any action/or changes made to the management plan. We so love this area and or rivers and we just want to be left to enjoy it when we get a chance!!  
Thank you!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 880 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 14:18:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The plans submitted for the changes to be implemented to the Ozarks Scenic Riverways are very contraindicated regarding the people who reside in the Ozarks of Missouri. Decreasing the amount of mileage



on the equestrian trails, limiting the river crossings even more than done to date, and requiring a user fee/bridle tag are grossly unfair to this populous. We are already living in the most economically depressed area in the whole of the USA., so we don't need any further governmental regulations, taxes or rules imposed upon us! My vote is for NO changes to be imposed on our 'public' lands and to let them remain public! Let them return to the management of the State of Missouri instead of the control of Washington, D. C. beaurocrats!

The local television news should also be notified regarding any purposed changes to 'PUBLIC' lands so that ALL of the people should made aware of these purposed changes to our lifestyle, economy, and recreation sites.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 881    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 14:20:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No change

---

**Correspondence ID:** 882    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 14:22:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GMP.  
I was stunned at the lack of interest in public opinion at the Eminence Public Meeting.

Is there not a decent person left at the Park Service?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 883    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 14:48:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support "plan B".

---

I love the river and fish, canoe and camp there frequently, following Leave No Trace outdoor principals. It means a lot to me. Please also consider the following historical context...

Sigurd Olson was a conservation leader that helped establish the Current River designation and many other National Parks around the country. He argued that these resources are vital places for people to escape the stressors of the modern world and to rejuvenate the soul. I (we) have been the benefactor of that legacy and have used the Current River exactly that way.

Sigurd predicted also, that the future would inevitably bring even more intense pressure for development, mining, and other consumptive or high impact uses of the resources in our public trust as our population increases. We are now at this crossroads, and we need to make the right choice- -the best compromise we can strike which will preserve (and improve) the integrity of this precious place that we are entrusted with, so that future generations may continue to experience its benefits.

Again, and please, enact "plan B"

---

**Correspondence ID:** 884    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 14:53:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support "plan B".

---

I love the river and fish, canoe and camp there frequently, following Leave No Trace outdoor principals. It means a lot to me. Please also consider the following historical context...

Sigurd Olson was a conservation leader that helped establish the Current River designation and many other National Parks around the country. He argued that these resources are vital places for people to escape the stressors of the modern world and to rejuvenate the soul. I (we) have been the benefactor of that legacy and have used the Current River exactly that way.

Sigurd predicted also, that the future would inevitably bring even more intense pressure for development, mining, and other consumptive or high impact uses of the resources in our public trust as our population increases. We are now at this crossroads, and we need to make the right choice. In this case, the best compromise we can strike which will preserve (and improve) the integrity of this precious place that we are entrusted with appears to be Plan B.

Again, and please, enact "plan B"

---

**Correspondence ID:** 885    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 14:58:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Do not make any changes to the management plan. I live in this area so that I can enjoy the rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 886    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 15:39:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** First of all..  
The fact you have set this up with several different options one of which is noted as ..... "No Action" is misleading and totally wrong.. Its a known fact that anyone who in fact chooses this option will not be counted in the process at ALL ! So guess the park service wants some extra insurance that they can get what they want and the tax payers or local people wont ..

I do NOT want any river access closed nor do I want to have outboard motors or the right to ride horses on trails stopped. Im sure that a major law suit is forecoming.....

I don't believe that the NPS will consider or allow anything on the riverways except the draft plan as it is ..

---

**Correspondence ID:** 887    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 15:45:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to express my deep satisfaction that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways system haabeen established and continues to funciton as it has. I have been a regular user of the various Ozark Scenic Riverways for over 40 years (since even before its establishment). I float on the Current/Jack's Fork Rivers several times each year. I have also floated on the Eleven Point River in the past. My family and I enjoy river floating very much and find this to bde an extremely pleasant experience on these rivers in their present condition.  
2 Summers ago I floated on the Niangua River on a midsummer weekend and found it to be totally overwhelmed with drunken partiers. There was literally thousands of college or other young people on the river, with numbers that were truly overwhelming for such a river. In some of the more challenging river turns one would literally bounce off of multiple other canoes and rafts who tended to congest on such locations. The experience was very different from the more serene experience tha twe find on the Current River. I would hope very seriously that the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers would never become so overfilled with young drunken people. The Niangua was not an experience I would consider ever sharing with my young children or older parents.  
The National Scenic Riverways is an excellent system and one I support very strongly. I am aware of some of the discontent with this from some of the local people who live in these areas, but I think a much greater good is served with the Scenic Riverways System. I work with people who have grown up in Shannon County and they seem to also be supportive of the Scenic Riverways system.  
These clean, natural river systems are truly a treasure that should be protected from careless destruction at the hand of those who fail to appreciate the inherent beauty and fragility of these river systems. I enjoy seeing other people enjoying these river systems, particularly when they also make effort to help protect these rivers for future users. I was disappointed to learn that the National Scenic Riverways system had backed off of attempt develop a management plan for the North Fork (of the White)River. I understand that this was due to unhappiness expressed by many of the local landowners and river users. From my perspective, I have not found the National Scenic Riverways system to be an impediment to enjoying these rivers. It has infact helped very much to maintain the quality of these rivers and their surrounding environment. Overuse of the rivers, degradation of the river banks and watersheds, and accumulation of trash could all serve to destroy much of the beauty and quality of these rivers.

Many people are not really conservation minded and fail to see beyond their own personal wants or pleasures. I strongly believe that an overall management by a system such as the National Scenic Riverways is the best way to insure that a proper management plan can be put in place and enforced. To do less than this would be a travesty I feel.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 888 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 15:49:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** No access to Current river means people in our areas lose their jobs. The river is a highly significant source of revenue for the small surrounding towns. Not only is it a source of income and a boost economically in our areas, but it is a beautiful river that is enjoyed by so many people. The river is a way of life for most people in our area. People from the city don't understand and should have no say in the preservation of the river. It is not a way of life for them. They simply are the type of people who come to our area and trash the river and have no respect for it! Yes, they do boost our revenue in the summer time, but it is mere to what the locals compensate to the equation. Like any business you have to take the good with the bad. I feel as if the river access was shut down in the hot spots as this plan implements it would devastate our communities! Living in this region is hard enough economically, but to take a natural resource that boosts revenue and helps our communities thrive is unfair. WE the people who love, cherish, respect and live for Current river should have final say in this plan. No one from the city who doesn't understand the full picture should even get to speak on behalf of this plan. The heart of this area is our river access. When you leave this part of the state and people try to figure out where Ellington, Van Buren, Doniphan, Eminence and other surround towns are they always relate it to Current River. The beautiful river you read and hear about. The beautiful river you live off of. The beautiful river that brings tourists to our area to camp, float and fish. The beautiful river that has the prettiest springs in the country. The list goes on and on. Something as dramatic as closing down access is heartbreaking and scary at the same time. There are bigger problems in this country then to pin point the preservation of Current River. How about taking a look into places that are polluting and not taking care of their rivers. Those would dry up faster wouldn't they?? Our river is here to stay for many more generations. This whole idea is based on city folk "facts" and computer time lapsed projections. When really no one knows how long it will be around. We are not supposed to know, we need to be able to enjoy the access while we can and continue to take of it the way we currently do. Please reconsider your plan. WE do not need any economic impacts anymore on our communities in this area. Think of the people...

---

**Correspondence ID:** 889 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 16:36:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Plan B of the ONSR General Mgt Plan.

As a regular user of the Current River and Jacks Fork River, I think Plan B provides the best and most diverse use for the affected areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 890 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 17:02:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Sirs:

I respectfully request the "No Action Alternative" be the course the National Park Service takes for the riverways in our area. We live on those banks in the summer with our kids and grandkids. We pick up trash, we clean up other peoples messes, and happy to do it just to be able to swim and have fun on the river.

So many of our freedoms are being taken away by the government. Please realize the people of this county and others have enjoyed these areas without the government for sometime and would like to continue.

Cedar Grove and Big Creek allow my 68 yr.old husband access to wading the river and fishing. Close those and he will not be able to get to those 2 waters. He use to have another place to wade, but the government now says property owners own that part of the river. Another freedom gone.

Sincerely  
Judy Wilmont

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	891	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 17:04:47				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I'm quite curious how many of these comments get read. I'm also curious how much each of these "meetings" cost. Is there a way to find this out? Thanks!				
<hr/>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	892	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 17:11:06				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	i feel number c is the best option there is veery little canoe or tubers below big springs dont limit horse power				
<hr/>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	893	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 17:25:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	There is always a conflict between preservation and use. Given the extraordinary national resource represented by the ONSR, the ideal course would be Alternative A to provide the maximum preservation. It still allows quite a lot of use even by motorboats. Missouri has many rivers, but only one ONSR,				
<hr/>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	894	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 17:32:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The perferred plan seems to be reasonable with the exception of the closure of the river to 'NO MOTORS" year round. In the winter months you will find very few tourist floating the the river in canoes and by shutting the river off to allow no motors year round, there is now a portion of the river that is not being enjoyed by anybody. I beleive it would be more resonable to make these areas seasonal so the locals could still enjoy fish gigging in motor boats in the winter. Which is an Ozark tradition in many families.				
<hr/>					
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	895	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 17:38:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am in favor of Alternative B, or a modification of B, for the following reasons:				
<p>First let me say I have canoed, kayaked, or jet boated all 134 miles of ONSR for the past 27 years. And while my canoeing/kayaking days are being limited some by my age, I now own a jet boat.</p> <p>I feel this riverway is "owned" by all people of this great nation. The fact that it is a NATIONAL scenic riverway demands that those entrusted to manage it do so with all users in mind. Alternative B is a good compromise between extreme primitive management and the no action alternative that is strangling the river and its delicate natural resources.</p> <p>I find comfort in knowing that there will be sections of the river where a floater can enjoy it without encountering a noisy boat or vehicle. I have experienced overnight float trips on the Jacks Fork where my camping experience on a gravel bar was interrupted by a pickup truck driving past my tent. If I want to camp on national scenic river I feel I should be able to choose a section of river where I can avoid vehicles or at least know what gravel bars they have access to.</p> <p>National treasures should be managed for a wide diversity of users so as long as the natural resources are not negatively impacted.</p> <p>If I had one suggestion to Alt. B it would be this: Consider motorboat use from Nov. 15 - Jan. 15 between Akers and Pulltite. This would accommodate the giggers yet avoid the floaters who are here to see the fall colors.</p> <p>I would also like to suggest a couple of information needs to help clear up any confusion.</p> <p>1. The plan talks about being able to maintain 20 access but does not yet identify which ones. Are these the canoe</p>					

concession accesses? If so, can you make that clear and at least name all those.

2. A visual map of all the river accesses that are under consideration, both permitted and unpermitted will help people better understand the challenge you are up against with maintaining them all.

Thank you for listening.

Dave Mayers  
Howell County Landowner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 896 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 17:55:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There needs to be no change and open to the public in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Van Buren, MO. We're strictly against making primitive areas, closing roads & limiting access to the river. We think there needs to be more regulations on non watercraft such as tubes and floatation devices, this is not a theme park & that is what it has been turned into. It needs to be for fishing, boating and family outings. we would like to see higher horsepower on boats up river, it has been years since we have been up river and we live here, this is our home and parts of the river we never see. It's unfair to the people with higher horsepower boats & what are they suppose to sell what they already own? It's not fair to the locals as we said before this is our home & the government is trying to keep us from enjoying the outdoors around us.

Best Regards,  
Rusty & Sandy Helvey  
Van Buren, MO 63965

helveyr@hughes.net  
helveys@hughes.net

---

**Correspondence ID:** 897 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 17:58:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am very concerned about the maintenance of our wild areas, I teach students about the environment and want our wild regions to maintain pristine and be well-kept. I strongly support the Plan B option for maintenance.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 898 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 18:07:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** leave motors alone and river access

---

**Correspondence ID:** 899 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 18:08:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** leave river access alone and motor alone

---

**Correspondence ID:** 900 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 18:10:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** No change in motor size, no closing of river access

---

**Correspondence ID:** 901 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 18:11:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** please leave the river and motor access alone .. let us enjoy the river and take of them

---

**Correspondence ID:** 902 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 18:18:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** dontt take river access away and boat

---

**Correspondence ID:** 903 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 18:27:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No action, I suggest that the NPS leave things as they are.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 904 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 19:56:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I agree with the need to reevaluate the management plan and I like using current biology practices to manage the area but I think less emphasis should be placed on Indiana bats and Ozark hellbenders. I think we should protect endangered species but not to the extent of limiting other activities that have little to no impact on these species. If the Plan B can be implanted without stopping the access or changing the current hunting, fishing, and trapping activities then I would agree to move forward. Limiting these activities would, in my opinion, stop several users from benefitting from one of our states wild treasures.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 905 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 21:39:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This new Ozark Riverways alternative b is the most inconsiderate idea for the rivers I've ever heard of! I will not have my rights to the river taken away become your agency is more worried about the revenue from the tourists!! I have lived near current river my entire life and I spend more days on the river in a year and spend more money in a year than a group of 10 tourists will. I do not want to here that money is not your objective because a member of the parks service told my family, to their face, that the tourists money was more of and importance than the locals money. The boats are not the problem on the river, the inner tubers that get drunk and block the whole river are the problem. You are doing no help to the environment or the area by making it harder for us boat owners to use the river!! I will make you a promise, if this passes I will never apply for a river pass. I will go on the river whenever I want and wherever I want. I will fight for my rights even if that meens taking it to court. You have heard my voice and if you don't take the voice of the people seriously you will regret it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 906 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 08:05:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I grew up in the Ozarks and have many family members living in Dent, Shannon, and Reynolds counties. My primary concern with the plan is the effect to local families who have made the commitment to live in and around the Ozarks and its waterways. The lengthy plan includes limited information related to the traditions and heritage of the local people. It seems that once again, a local heritage is at risk of being marginalized to support non-local visitors enjoying the home of someone else.

The people of the Ozarks have a rich and deep heritage of living with the rivers and streams in a symbiotic way. They know and care for their home. I would be in strong opposition to the plan alternatives that weaken the access and use of waterways for the locals. I've spent many afternoons fishing on Current river between Baptist Camp and Akers Ferry. I've gigged Pultite and Round Spring areas. I've floated around Van-Buren. And I hope to take my young sons to these beautiful places as they grow. In all that time, I have seen locals picking up the trash of visitors. I've seen local men standing up for values in the presence of women when others (often drunk) are lewd and disrespectful. I've seen the local take the time to explain the history and ecological significance of a feature on the waterways. The men and women of the Ozarks are among the most hospitable you will meet and they love welcoming visitors into their homeland - and they do so with respect and genuine care. They resist the urge to become unwelcoming to all guests because of the actions of a few.

My concern is that the effects of this plan (particularly Alt B) will result in forcing unnecessary changes on the people who call the Ozarks home. The current regulations - when enforced - create a wonderful experience for locals and guests alike. A respectful local gigger with a 60/40 engine following the existing rules causes no problems for

visitors - quite the opposite. I've seen gigging boats used to pick up trash, clean the streams, shuttle guests, and get visitors to safety in the event of an accident or storm. A rude person with little respect for others will cause problems with a motor of any size. The same goes for ATV's, horses, access, campsites, etc. Adding restrictions will hamper the rule-abiding citizens and guests, and those ignoring the existing regulations will continue to ignore the new regulations.

My preference would be Alternative A (no action) with added resources to enforcing current regulations. I believe that adding resources to protecting this beautiful culture and landscape make it an attractive place for families to visit. It is indeed a national and state treasure - but we should always remember that it is also the home to a rich, friendly and viable culture of men and women that love their land and streams. They are one of the most valuable resources in the area - not an obstacle to the vacation of visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 907    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 08:15:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It cannot be said enough. People should not be restricted from using the rivers. It has been done for years, and problems did not arise until the National Park Service took ownership of them. Then and only then did problems arise, as in Yosemite National Park.

Being raised in this area and along the Current River, I can tell you that people were not restricted from using the waterways by individual ownership along the edges of them. My grandfather never refused anyone access to the river through his land.

There is nothing wrong with the management plan as it is now, except for the restrictions concerning gravel removal from the tributaries.

Dirt and Gravel Roads are in no way the main cause of sediment to streams. There were no problems when the National Park Service purchased them. Conviction and false advertisement from the Lobbyist groups have hurt the traditional way of taking care of the Ozarks.

The problem of silt into the waterways was taken care of in part by the Counties taking gravel from the small streams and putting it to use elsewhere before it being washed into the rivers. Occupants keeping the springs and creeks clean contributed to the free-flowing waters.

Where is the end to all this? There are many, many, many beautiful places in the United States. Do the people in Washington think they can take hold of every one so that the whole of the US can have use of them?

There is no way that environmentalism is a bad thing. Care needs to be taken. But there is such a thing as 'going too far'. And it is going too far to say that local uses of these rivers should be restricted. Yes, there are those who don't play by the rules. There will always be. We cannot create a perfect world. But what good is something beautiful if it can't be enjoyed? Like Yosemite National Park. It was purchased. Tax payers whom own it pay to see it. Now they are saying it is being overused. What did they expect would happen? What purpose does it serve just sitting there?

I am proud of my heritage, and love the area in which I was born and live. Near the Current River, where my great-grandfather, grandfather, father and our family once roamed. It is my plea that the general management plan remain as is. Thank You.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 908    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 08:23:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Concerning the nps management plan for the Ozark river ways I wish to convey my desire of NO ACTION. I want the plan to stay as it is with no further restrictions. Please head our cry as we are the people that live here. We love our river and wish to continue enjoying it as we have.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 909 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 08:28:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have grown up on Current River and spent a majority of my time there since I was a baby. I have literally spent every weekend there in the summer if not 4 or 5 days out of the week there in the summer. All iv ever known is fishing, hunting, and having fun on the river. Doing things such as swimming, boat ridding, etc. If you didn't grow up there then you don't understand. Just like maybe your idea of fun is going golfing or going out to a country club. Maybe that's all you have done since you were a kid. You probably wouldn't be to happy about giving all your hobbies and fun activities up. It's our life, our way of living. My parents spent every summer on the river, their parents spent their time there, and their parents and so on. It's all we know and it's something I'm willing to fight for. I look forward to spending my time on this river and gravel bar every year. Not just in the summer but in the fall and winter. I love to hunt and fish and gig, as well as my whole family and all my friends. It saddens me that it could all be taken away. Let alone, it will destroy our community. It will take away jobs, leaving people unemployed. We base our whole lives around this community and our rivers. Jacks Fork and Current rivers are recreational areas and they should stay that way!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 910 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 08:30:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

The NPS needs to go back to the original reason of why the ONSR was created and live by the guidlines the committee laid out then.

The committe stated in 1964 they wished to emphasize the importance of "creating Federal land for recreational use". The State of Missouri gave the ONSR the right of existance back then and the NPS should keep that in consideration when EVERY County Commissioner, State Representative & Senator and our US Congressman are against the proposal being set forth by the plan.

The NPS needs to consider ALL recreation and the value it gives to the local communities. The people who live here have endured enough change and regulation already. That's why I support "No Action". Leave everything as is, enforce the rules already provided and many of the issues the NPS claims could be resolved.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 911 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 08:37:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thanks for the opportunity to comment. I strongly support Alternative A. The NPS has an obligation to the people of the United States and to the residents of Missouri to take very seriously its obligations to maintain and protect the water quality and natural resource value of the streams and land along them. The NPS actually acquired this land from owner/residents of the region, with the express purpose of protecting the land for access and enjoyment by more people. To do anything less than maintain the maximum protection for our great grandchildren and beyond would seem like a betrayal of a trust.

I realize that there are many competing interests for use of the land and waters. It seems that frequently one group of users wants to blame another group for the problems with erosion, habitat decline, pollution, etc. Each group of potential users should be mandated to maintain the strictest protection of the rivers and corridors. Thus, just as in western rivers, canoe livery services should rent or provide free access to human waste containers so that canoe visitors do not leave human waste on the banks. Horses should be required to wear feces collectors or be banned for the river banks and in stream activities. Private land owners should be required to keep cattle out of tributary streams. These simple recommendations are just practical actions. Everyone needs to do his or her part to protect this valuable resource. Motorized vehicles should be strictly limited in the scenic river area. Natural systems are impacted by noise; and "quiet" places are among the most difficult natural resources to find anywhere in the USA.

I urge NPS to do what it can to limit motorized vehicles near the rivers, strictly limiting access points for users, and prohibiting off road vehicles, as well as motorized river craft anywhere above Eminence, MO.

I also recognize there is an attitude among some residents that they should be able to use and abuse the land as they



see fit. It is for this reason the NPS took on the historic responsibility of creating the scenic rivers program and I trust that the NPS will live up to that obligation to protect the rivers for all citizen and not let a few damage them for all.

Although I prefer the Alternative A, I can live with the NPS "preferred" alternative B, so long as the NPS does indeed protect the Big Spring Wilderness study area as wilderness and remove illegal roads and so long as the NPS does set stringent standards including the recommendations I make above, for requiring users to take a role in protecting the rivers. I also approve of the NPS providing educational services, because that is critical to appreciation of natural resources that many of our citizens seem to lack.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 912 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 09:45:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I grew up in the Current River area for 20 years and my family and ancestors pioneered this area. We were always taught to honor and respect the riverways and land. If you camp, fish, hunt, boat, swim, or just enjoy the day at the river you leave the area just as you found it or leave it better. Who are you NPS or Federal Govt. to tell us what to do in our own home (riverways). Since we have been protecting our resources for generations. No Action! No Action! No Action!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 913 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 10:08:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been floating the Current and Jacks Fork rivers for more than 40 years. I usually float from Montauk State Park to Round Spring on the Current, and from The Prongs to Eminence on the Jacks Fork. I favor Alternative B on the draft management plan, and thank the National Park Service for helping to curb abuses of these wonderful resources.

I seldom float on summer Saturdays because of the crowds. My favorite floating seasons are spring, when the wildflowers are blooming, and fall, when the autumn colors are on display. I also float on warm winter days, and do an annual New Year's Eve float with friends.

When on a float trip, I stay at Montauk lodge, River's Edge Resort or Round Spring Retreat. I am too old to camp.

The noise and booze restrictions implemented in recent years by the NPS have helped curb the rowdiness, but there are still practices that have an adverse impact on anyone seeking a bit of solitude on the rivers.

There is nothing like the roar of a jetboat through the valley to spoil a float. I have witnessed these boats eroding the river banks and scouring the gravel beds, where all things nest. I usually don't float the lower stretches of the rivers, and sacrifice these areas to the powerboaters.

I also object to the ATVers who think the river is a place to play and the gravel bars are for ripping around.

The locals who argue that they know best how to manage these resources have short memories. I am old enough to remember when the woods were cut to the nub, and every rain brought more gravel into the streams. There were few deer and no turkey.

IT WAS STATE AND FEDERAL PURCHASES AND PROGRAMS (AND, YES, RESTRICTIONS) THAT BROUGHT BACK THE CURRENT AND JACKS FORK RIVER VALLEYS.

We do not want to cut anyone off from these rivers. We want to assure that they are protected for all future users, in as pristine a shape as possible.

If you want to see what happens when no one protects the resources, float the stretch of the Jacks Fork within the five-mile Eminence zone. Someone has way to the river. The land is now eroding, and the landowner is using broken concrete slabs to line the river bank. A bit downstream, another property owner has erected his fence so his cattle can enter the river to wallow. Finally, there is a historic river crossing in the stretch where ATVers play in the water. The law says they can cross the river, but not run up and down the stream bed. Try telling them that.

Thanks for your help.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 914 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 10:23:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The govt. always believes that it knows what is best, when so often we see we they are wrong. Usually only after we already have there policies plastered on us. The national park service would now like to impose new restrictions on us, our recreational areas, and eventually or homes. The river under there proposal and the lands around are taking care of more by the people who live here than anyone else. Outsiders come in here, leave there trash for us to pick up. Then again outsiders want to decide what is best for our local resources. I urge everyone to speak your mind. Make sure our voice is heard. Tell the govt. that there new restrictions are not wanted or welcome here. This is OUR HOME!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 915    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 10:32:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Living on land close to the river and appreciating the natural beauty and quietness of the river we prefer to have only non-motorized boats on the upper Current. We would like to vote in favor of "Plan A". We feel that there are already plenty of places for folks who love their gadgets to to go a and play with them. We have no problem with gigging if the folks are not using motorized boats with generators. If they can use traditional means without disturbing those close to the river and our livestock, fine.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 916    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 10:33:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in total support of the "No Action" alternative. Any change to the existing plan will be detrimental to this area. Our community exists mainly on the tourism trade. If you make any changes, this will have an adverse effect on our local economy. The companies that exist in this area employ a lot of our high school kids and their parents throughout the tourist season. Jobs in this area are scarce and for anyone to have a job, it is extremely important that we keep those jobs that are available. The impact is unbelievable. You have the person who builds the boats and we have several in this area. Then there are the boat dealerships and of course the dealerships have their contacts at the local bank where they send people purchasing boat to go to for the financing. We have the individuals who do the upholstery for the boats who work out of their homes just to have on rental expenses. Then you have the private individuals who do the graphics for the boats and the polishing of the boats for those who like to keep their boats polished. That is just the boating industry alone. In the summertime, boats are on the river every weekend enjoying what nature provides. The tourist industry impacts every area in this town from gas stations who rely heavily on the tourist trade to the restaurants, grocery stores, the t-shirt shop, beauty shops, auto repair places, etc. Just the economic impact alone is reason enough not to make any changes.

As far as individual areas- -river access needs to be left alone. There are many individuals who camp along the river and having the river access nearby for them to launch their boats is a major convenience, especially when you have tourists who are stranded on a gravel bar too afraid to get back in the water and no other way to get back to their hotel, which happened this past fall. My husband had to rescue 5 individuals, some of whom were elderly and overweight as they were too afraid to proceed. He was camped at Jerktail and luckily was able to launch his boat, go upriver several times to brings those individuals and their gear back to camp where their vender was able to come and get them. There have been numerous times that canoers have stopped at our camp and needed assistance and because we had our boat right there or the mere fact that we were camped their with our vehicle, we were able to assist them in their time of need. We have had people who dallied too long up river and missed their pick-up time 7 miles downriver so we had to call their vendor to notify them of where to pick up their people. If we aren't allowed to camp in these wilderness areas, who is going to help these people then. You can't even get cell phone service on the river. At least by camping there we are able to climb in our vehicle and drive to the top of the hill to get service.

Horsepower-if there is any change at all it should be to put into writing that the horsepower is 60/40 so that those jet boats are considered legal. As it stands, the rules show that horsepower is to be measured at the powerhead and not at the jet. There are too many times where the jet boats have had to come to the aid of individuals on the river in situations where time was of the essence and there were no park service individuals around to help. You start regulating even more the horsepower that the boats have and that assistance won't be as timely.

Majority of the residents in this area cannot afford to take vacations, but with the way things are now, they can afford to take their family camping at one of the many river accesses for very little expense and that is the only vacation they can afford. Implementing your plan will stop them from enjoying what nature and God have provided.

Trails need to be left as they are. Is it really fair to exchange 65 miles of trails for 23 miles of trails?? I think not. This severely limits our tourists. At least with the 65 miles of trails they can ride and not have to remain on the same trail which would create more erosion than what we already have. The horseback riding industry in this town amounts to approximately 25% of the local tourist trade. You start cutting out the trails and that is going to drop significantly.

During last year's Federal cut-backs, we (the locals) took care of the property, we picked up the trash and debris that the tourists left behind. We even hung signs informing visitors to take their trash with them as the park service would not pick it up. We, as individual taxpayers own the property and why should someone who never visits our park or who only visits our parks once a year be allowed to govern our rights. They aren't here to take care of it and during a federal shutdown we aren't even allowed to have access. If I own a portion, I ought to be allowed access regardless of whether or not the government can afford to function. It's not my fault that the federal government can't manage their finances better. You take our rights away from us and who will take care of it then. LEAVE OUR PARK ALONE!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 917 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 10:42:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear NPS,

I want to express my opinion of the general management plan regarding the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I AM TOTALLY AGAINST ANY CHANGES!!! I was born and raised in the heart of Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. My family's heritage goes back several generations of people who used the river for many reasons, either to make a living logging down the river, building boats for people to use or just plain recreational swimming with cousins, family BBQ's on the gravel bar, camping, etc. There are MANY local businesses in the area that would suffer great losses if people's rights are taken away of using the rivers. I take my kids on a regular basis to the river year round. I want them to experience the same family get togethers that I had when growing up on the river. It would be a SHAME for them not to be able to get to do the things that I got to do as a child. My family also depends on the river use as a way to make a living. If you have ever been to the area, jobs are scarce. The changes that the NPS are proposing would be a disaster to the area economics as well as the way of life. The NPS has made changes along the way that should have not been made. But this time, we are STANDING FIRM! Our voices need to be heard...every elected official that represents the area is against any changes. We the people have a say in this! We the people do not want any more changes!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 918 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 10:54:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** alternative A would help eliminate illegal roads and crossings. too many river crossings and roads running all over is creating a mess and ruins the tranquility of the national riverways and forest.

thank you,  
suzanne smith

---

**Correspondence ID:** 919 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 12:09:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The parks should be given back to the State.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 920 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 12:09:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** January 20, 2014

Superintendent

Ozark National Scenic Riverways

PO Box 490

Van Buren, MO 63965

REGARDS: Support of "No Action Alternative General Plan"

Superintendent:

When I was a young boy, my grandfather, Frank Roberts, owned 200 acres at the mouth of Rocky Creek on Current River. The National Park Service took the farm by eminent domain in the 60's. The NPS told my grandfather they were going to make the river a place where all people can always enjoy it. Unfortunately, that seems to no longer be the goal of the park service.

Through the years I have seen the changes that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways have made. They have made it where families can enjoy it for a day or a lifetime. There is access all up and down the river and room for everyone to enjoy it. If they want to canoe, tube, run a boat, go hiking, hunting, or fishing, or just enjoy the scenery and the beauty of the nature they can. Now, the ONSR is forgetting the purpose of our tax dollars spent. It is not for the special groups or lobbyist with money. It is for the enjoyment of all people.

I have spoken with the Department of Natural Resources and there is no study showing the riverways being misused or in a state of digression. The locals are very proud of their rivers and do many projects each year to keep the rivers clean, including a yearly clean out. Most trash and misuse comes from those coming into the park and not being educated on how our river systems work and how we operate as a community to keep them clean and cared for. We need to find a way to educate them about our river systems and the amazing ways this river system provides for our communities, and that we want to share our awesome rivers and parks with all.

So Mr. Superintendent, I am asking you and the committee to leave the river as it is, "No Action".

As for the wilderness area suggested for the now Big Springs area. We have an Irish Wilderness area of several thousands of acres just a few miles from here. This Irish Wilderness Area sees 400 to 700 visitors a year. This is as many visitors that Big Springs now accommodates in one day during peak season. So why the change if we are wanting to make this for the people? Can you give me a reason? Once again I state, "No Action".

Sincerely,

Rickie L Roberts

Mountain View, MO 65548

---

**Correspondence ID:** 921    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 12:10:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Upon the meeting held 01/21/14@ Van Buren community center, I was enlightened on the subject concerned. The reception was handled very professionally, needless to say, upon leaving I was satisfied!

My true concern was "HORSE POWER LIMITS".

As I explained to Jodie Towery, Lindel Gregory and Mr. Black, horsepower shouldn't be the issue, but the ones using the bigger horsepower engines.

Most always alcohol seems to bring out the need for speed in some. As a matter of "fact" there are 40/60 horsepower outboards being tweaked to out-perform the bigger horsepower engines. (case being) you will not eliminate hi-speed boats on the river system!

The outboard I use is: Evinrude E-TEC 175 h/p jet propelled, which in reality cuts the horse-power rating greatly, Evinrude spent millions of dollars in designing an outboard that by "fact" are the most fuel efficient, and by standards, the least amount of emissions by any manufacturer of outboard motors. This should stand above any decision the PARK SERVICE should mandate in the near future.

My wife Betty and I spend a week in the spring a week in the fall @ BIG SPRINGS CAMPGROUND LOOP 200, AND OUR PRIMARY USE OF THE BOAT IS SMALLMOUTH & WALLEYE FISHING, "FLOAT FISHING" THE ONLY TIME MY OUTBOARD RUNS IS WHEN IT IS TIME FOR LUNCH OR GETTING TO DARK TO SEE.

So please hear my plea, and if in the future upper h/p engines are eliminated, it would probably be the end of something my Wife and I have enjoyed the last several years.

Will all due respect, please consider

THANK YOU,  
DOYLE L.ABBEY

A response would be appreciated.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 922 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 12:45:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing as a concerned citizen regarding the effects the Draft General Management Plan will have to the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers.

Shutting down access to these rivers will have devastating effects on our local economy. For decades, the people of Missouri have successfully maintained and preserved the health of the rivers and surrounding areas. Local folks are more than capable of ensuring the health of the rivers, while permitting the public to use and enjoy the land they pay to preserve.

I strongly recommend that the National Park Service take a No-Action Alternative to prevent unnecessary restrictions on our public lands.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 923 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 12:45:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** i feel that since the tubers get out at the landing at Van Buran, Missouri.that we should be allow any horse power and in boards boats from Goose neck to Big Springs ...i was rised on this river and there is very little traffic from gooseneck to big springs any way...thank you please lets us all enjoy the river we live here ...

---

**Correspondence ID:** 924 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 13:09:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Any further restriction of the use of the river is not needed. We all like it the way it is and see no advantage to change other to keep people from enjoying this resource!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 925 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 13:11:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a life long Shannon County resident. We love our rivers and the land around them. We take excellent care of them. I feel you have imposed enough rules and regulations on us and the rivers we so love. They are a tradtion passed down from generation to generation, from fishing, boating and camping. It is very unfair and unjust that you let people who have never been here and know nothing about this part of the country dictate what goes on in our lives. Impose limits on every aspect of our outdoor lives. We don't try to impose our wishes on their city parks and their city life.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 926 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 13:15:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been going to Current river my entire life. For no reason should our rights to the river be taken away. It has always been public and should always be. It is our right as residents of Missouri, where we pay taxes for the upkeep of the river, to have access. This area is known for its beautiful river area and draws people from far away. This brings in revenue to our area as tourists come here just for the river. But more importantly, it is a way of life for the locals. No one should have the right to take that away.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 927 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 13:22:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It's plain and simple...My husband and I grew up going to Current River in Shannon County, also known as Cortariva/Log Yard. We grew up swimming, boating, fishing, camping, grilling, spending time with family there during the Summer and Fall-Winter Months(Gigging) Now married 22 years this is where we spend every Sunday afternoon after Church. We have five children and want them to grow up enjoying this beautiful place. We spend entire days there and camp often. We always clean up after ourselves and have never left trash or anything on the gravel bar. I am a photographer and enjoy riding over in the fall and winter months to photograph the Eagles on the cliffs and the elk that have moved in. They don't seem bothered by us at all! Please let us continue our traditions and respect our wishes. I have several close friends that own Cabins on River..I can't imagine them losing their Family Cabins. Local hosts clean up weekends, and go down and clean up the river. Do we ever see City-Folk-or so called People against what we are doing down there helping? NO! It's always US the locals!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 928 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 13:24:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To Whom This May Concern,

I am a life long resident of Reynolds County and through the years I have seen many families come to our local rivers and parks and it is so sad to see that the government is taking the joy from our surroundings. In this day and time when we need to support tourism and try and generate the economy you are taking livelihood from those that depend on these incomes. WHY~ would you close access to some of the most beautiful parts of the Missouri where people come from close and far away to enjoy, what is the purpose to do this just to say you can! I have many family members that have cabins and boats that have for many years used and enjoy this area and CARE for the land. I am so as is my entire family and it is time for US to take back what is OURS! STAND DOWN big government you are not welcome HERE. Please take your concerns on more important things like that effect our nation that people enjoying our local parks and streams that I am sure many of you have never been a visitor to. On behalf of my family get out of our county and out of our parks and rivers you NPS are not welcome here.

Sincerely

Cynthia G. Gastineau

---

**Correspondence ID:** 929 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 13:38:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I grew up in Reynolds County and on the Current - Black and Jacks Fork Rivers. I worked one summer for the Conservation program cleaning up and maintaining the camping areas and rivers. From what I observed during that time, most of the damage, destruction and problems came from the people that did not live in the area. If there is restricted access for the rivers the people who live and work there locally will be the ones hurt the most. Locals are the ones taking care of the rivers and making sure they are kept clean so that generations of their family are able to use and enjoy the rivers as they were. We no longer live in Missouri but when we do come back to visit the thing we look forward to the most is spending time on the river.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 930 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 14:08:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** If the federal government is 'for the people, by the people,' then how can the federal government tell us, the people, that we have no right to be on land that is essentially ours? When did our federal government switch from being 'for the people' to 'against the people?' I have never seen prettier rivers, and they are that way because we take care of them here. We have built businesses and lives around them. People from all over enjoy them, and even though those people don't respect them as well as us locals do, it's ok, because we gladly pick up their messes as well as our own. This is not the city where weekends are spent at shopping centers and movie theaters, this is the country. We don't want shopping centers and movie theaters. We don't want concrete parking lots and highways. We want gravel bars and crystal clear water. We want campfires and pictures of American Bald Eagles as they watch us from the trees. We want what we've always had, and who is the federal government to tell us it's not ours anymore? Who is the EPA to say we aren't environmentally friendly? How many eagles sit in trees near EPA head quarters and watch them go about their day? How many rivers are crystal clear in the city? How many

stars can be seen up there on a crystal clear night? I do believe the EPA should take a step back and re-evaluate who's doing a better job caring for our planet here, then I believe they should laugh and their own ridiculousness and start barking up someone else's tree. My "country" life and my "country" rivers are the last thing that need to be under reform in this world. It's seems to me that the EPA's efforts would make more sense if they were concentrated in their own backyard. I'm sure D.C. needs more of an 'environmentally friendly' clean up than Southeast Missouri.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 931 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 14:12:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I understand that the NPS is not going to consider the No Action Alternative. I may just be wasting my time but I think that the Federal Government should give the rivers back to the State of Missouri. If access to the river is decreased it will have a large economic effect on cities like Ellington and Eminence. Bans on motor vehicles should be eliminated from the GMP. The citizens that live and work near the rivers should have more to say about how they are managed than the "big city folks" and the enviromentalists. The people that use the river on a regular basis are the real enviromentalists. We take care of the river. We clean up after camping at the Logyard leaving it better then it was when we arrived. We pick up trash on the river. We want it to stay beautiful.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 932 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 14:18:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I urge the OSNR management plan to implement alternative A plan to preserve and enhance missouri's natural lands and water systems.  
In the last 30 years I have floated the Current, Black and Meramec Rivers and have felt increasingly distressed at the slow degradation of some of my favorite natural areas. The misuse of 4 wheelers on beaches and in the rivers are most egregious to me. I would love to see that a state wide education campaign were implemented to promote conservation and pride about our beautiful state resources.  
I fear that if we don't set a high bar, it may be harder and harder to keep pace with the increased usage of the parks. Thank you for all your work on this assessment. As a nature lover and Missourian I appreciate your efforts to get this right.  
Sincerely,  
Michele Isam  
4020 Delor St.  
St. Louis, MO  
63116

---

**Correspondence ID:** 933 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 14:26:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern:

In regards to the GMP of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, I would like to express my concern with the proposed changes. I understand that there are three action alternatives as well as a no action alternative. I strongly support the no action alternative! I also understand that this may not be considered a viable alternative that will be implemented, but it should be taken into consideration for a number of reasons. I have read over all of the alternatives and even the least restrictive is just that "RESTRICTIVE".

There are many reasons I am opposed to any of the proposed alternatives.

1. Land/River Zone Restrictions:

a. Heritage: It should be noted by the National Park Service that prior to the formation of the ONSR, this area was home to many people including my ancestors. That being said, this is where many of them rest in peace today. I find it very unfortunate that the same entity that took over their homeland would then deny their family access to their grave sites. By closing areas of the river or roads leading into the park, this could lead to lack of access to these areas. So you say, we could "hike" into these areas since we will no longer be able to access them by road or river, believe me when I say exercise is good for anyone. Unfortunately, I personally have family members who are either elderly, disabled from serving their country in war or who have medical conditions that have resulted in paralysis leaving them wheelchair bound. Do they not deserve the right to access a national park that isn't handicap accessible

by another means such as a motorized vehicle to visit the gravesites of their family members or just to enjoy the scenery? How will the NPS determine which roads are closed and which areas are going to no longer be accessible? Will the local citizens be polled to find out which families have loved ones buried in the cemeteries that existed before the NPS? I'm quite sure the handicap accessible visitor centers will not be located in these remote areas! Let's consider others who may not have family cemeteries, but may just want to explore the beauty of the park but are not physically capable. They could enjoy the area by UTV or a motorized boat which in some of the alternatives wouldn't be possible!

b. Local Economies: I am a local business owner and believe me when I say it is very difficult in a rural area to a) get a job b) keep a job c) run a business. The backbone of the economy in the local communities is tourism. As the NPS considers restricting access, they should also keep in mind they are restricting income of the people who live and work here. Many of our local stores, gas stations, motels, etc. depend on their summer income from tourism to survive. There are also several business owners who earn their living from the river with campgrounds and canoe/raft rentals. If they lose that income and have to close their doors, that will mean higher unemployment for our area which is already high! This in turn will affect other businesses as those individuals no longer have jobs that provide pay checks and health insurance.

c. Rights: My final thought is this: I am a United States citizen and enjoy the freedoms that come along with that privilege. I will say those privileges do not come without a price. My grandfather's farm was located in the middle of what is now the ONSR. It was basically taken from him; sell it or we will take it as the US government has the right to do! We also have rights. I am a tax payer that helps fund these programs the NPS wants to implement. I should still have the right to use and enjoy the land that once belonged to my family!

I do hope this comment is read with open ears and an open mind! I understand there are two sides to every controversy but I do hope these comments are taken into account as a decision is made.

Thank You,  
Heather McCormack

---

**Correspondence ID:** 934    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 14:27:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I FOR ONE AM VERY DISTURBED TO HERE THAT THEY ARE THINKING OF CLOSING THE CAMPSITES AND BOAT ACCESS THAT HAS BEEN AVAILABLE NOT ONLY TO THE PEOPLE OF REYNOLDS & SHANNON COUNTIES BUT TO FOLKS ALL OVER THE STATE WHO WANT TO COME AND FIND SERENE, BEAUTIFUL RELAXING PLACE TO SPEND VACATIONS. I AM A LIFE LONG RESIDENT OF REYNOLDS COUNTY. I HAVE BEEN ON THE RIVER SINCE I WAS A SMALL CHILD NOT ONLY BOATING BUT CAMPING, I THINK IT IS A BIG MISTAKE TO TAKE THIS PLEASURE AWAY FROM THE PEOPLE OF THE COUNTIES INVOLVED, BECAUSE SOMEONE ELSE THINKS THAT THEY NEED TO BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC. THERE IS A PLACE FOR EVERYONE ON CURRENT RIVER. FROM THE GRAVEL BAR SWIMMERS, THE BOATERS, THE CANOERS, FISHERS, ETC....THIS IS A BEAUTIFUL PIECE OF MISSOURI THAT SHOULD BE ENJOYED BY ALL WHO WISH TO ENJOY IT. THE LOSS OF RIVER PRIVELEGES COULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO SEVERAL BUSINESS' IN AND AROUND THE ELLINGTON, EMINENCE, VAN BUREN AND DONIPHAN AREAS. LEAVE IT ALONE!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 935    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 14:44:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Park Service is not managing the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers as they were meant to be. The rivers are for recreational use, boating, fishing, canoeing, camping. There are some things the park service could help with. Put more rangers patrolling the river. Get them out of their little "cubicles" and put them to work doing an actual job instead of sitting there trying to figure the best way to take something away from the people. Not to many years ago when you were employed by the PS you actually worked, whether it was patrolling the river or picking



up trash, they worked. Yes it makes me furious when I go to these "meetings" and see the uniforms with all their guns & bullet proof vests on. What a bunch of bull. And instead of having a meeting in Kirkwood, which happens to be just minutes from the sierra Club in Maplewood, have it on a big gravel bar on Current River - on a SATURDAY when more people can get there. But you don't want us there, do you. And by the way, speaking of the sierra Club, how much are they donating to the PS in this venture? People in Kirkwood/St. Louis have no idea how we use the river. The majority of them have probably not been anywhere near Current River. Do they even know what a Jet boat is, or do they think like most people that do not use the river that its like a jet engine on an airplane?

My opinion is to leave the river alone. The floods do more erosion than all the boats put together. Have there even been any studies done on this? And why close down part of the river not allowing any boats on it? People gig and fish on that part of the river the same as they do on other parts of the river. Everyone has their own favorite place. No, our ancestors did not have motorized boat, but they used the river & I think they used it more than we do. Cattle drank out of the river, they floated ties down the river, commissary boats went up & down the river delivering goods to the small communities along the way. You all ever checked that out?

So just leave the river alone. Leave the boats alone. Leave the horses and ATV riders alone. And I think it would be better managed if the State of Missouri took it back.

Have you considered the amount of revenue that boats alone bring in? We pay for license, sales tax and property tax. That goes a long way in helping pay your salary. Then the towns have the revenue when we buy gas & picnic items.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 936    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Has any one taken into consideration the closing of roads/trails that may limit access of utilities in the area for maintenance of existing facilities?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 937    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 15:13:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom this may Concern:

In 1969 the NPS bought 320ac from my grandparents Everett E. and Flora V. Bland, which would be the land access to the gravel bar (Ant Hole). My grandparents were not willing to sell but were led to believe that if they kept the land they would not be able to even so much as cut a stick of wood. Now to me if I own it it's mine and I DO NOT want anyone telling me what I can or can not do with it!! Government or not!! Later they found out that if they wouldn't have sold the NPS would have just owned 300ft of the bank. They like many others in the area, my husband's family included (Frank Roberts) was lied to. All of these farms which are now just standing brush or the fields which are so rough your haying equipment will tear up; could have been farmed and took care of like they were meant to be. So no when you tell me that you are doing this for our own good or just let it go back to nature I think naturally you are feed me and everyone in this community a line!! Leave us alone we bother no one and yes the rivers are meant to be shared with everyone. No way would I want someone not to be able to enjoy our beauty but on the other hand I DO NOT go to the city and tell them how they need to maintain their city streets or anything else. So why do "they" need to feel like "they" can control us in the Ozarks?! When you start putting all of these regulation on .....who really are they for? The people that are here for maybe a week out of the year? Or for the ones who actually live here year round?

Sincerely,  
Susanna Needels

---

**Correspondence ID:** 938    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 15:22:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I read an artical today from the meeting in salem. It stated that there are currently no restrictions on horse power. Well I beg to differ I quite vividly remember riding in a 200 horsepower boat as a child and that is now resticted to 40 horse. The second comment in this artical that made me angry was, jet boats are not part of our heritage. Well I think the person that made this statement is an idiot! I don't think it could be any more part of my heritage if I tried. My great grandfather owned part of this property that is now the scenic river ways. He

farmed this land he hunted this land he enjoyed this land. It was basically stolen from him. That is my heritage. My grandfather owned part of this land he farmed it he also worked on the river as a young man. He had a motor boat and he loved current river. He brought his family up to love it also. This is my heritage. My mother was born within a few miles of current river and she has been a part of river life all of her life. She has had a boat on this river for 40 years. This is part of my heritage. Myself, I have been on the river for 33 years. I love it, I enjoy every moment spent there. This is part of my heritage. My children have been on this river for the last 10 years. Starting at the early age of 8 days old. This is part of my heritage and the beginning of theirs. I understand the need of keeping our park pristine. But what I don't get is the federal government thinking they can do a better job of that than us. We are the ones who clean up the waters. We are the ones that help confused and stranded tourists. We are the ones who own this river and we should be the ones who decide how we get to do that. I think that the NO CHANGE option is the only option!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 939    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 15:30:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I read a quote today from Mr. Black "They don't like to hear it. Local people see the riverways every day. They don't notice the little changes that are obvious to visitors that only come once a year, or the people that are trained to take care of it,". Well sir where are these facts. Why can't you show us some proff that the water ways are in so much danger. We do realize that the river changes every year and for some very good reasons. Flooding and weather. The only way you are going to stop this is if... oh wait you can't. The no action plan is the only option. The rest are just big government trying to get bigger. No thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 940    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 15:53:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,

I first would like to thank you for all of the hard work you do to preserve our great land nationwide. I am commenting concerning the ONSR Draft Management Plan. I frequently fish the upper and lower Current river for trout and smallmouth bass. I have been very concerned with the excessive use of the river in certain areas. The road from Cedar Grove to Parkers has become a 4x4 jeep trail that is overused in the summer. The Current river above Welch is not a very big river and is quite small to be used by jet boats. Jet boats have the run of the river on every river in Missouri. I believe it to be necessary to preserve the river now for future generations. I am in support of Plan B and I wish you all the best in the future.

Daniel C. Kelly

---

**Correspondence ID:** 941    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 16:04:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I come down to MO. a couple of times per year, sometimes with my family. We come down to camp, ride horses and tube on the Jacks Fork River. I feel the state should retain all waterway rights. I see nothing wrong with letting the people involved with and living on the waterway determine what is best for it. Let politicians in Washington deal with the debt problem they have brought on. Get rid of the free handouts to people who think handouts are a way of life. Deal with the illegal aliens and quit giving them money and benefits earned by American citizens for American citizens. Until those issues are resolved don't start making new problems for the waterways. Mo people depend of tourist trade to make their living. Don't interfere with that. Like I said before, you have a lot more issues in your own backyard to deal with.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 942    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 16:40:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The river has been a way of life for my family for as long as I can remember. We use the river year round. We camp and fish there in the spring/summer, we bow fish in the fall and gig in the winter. We have spent countless summer days boat riding on the river. My children learned how to swim in the river. The river is very important to us.

I feel that no action should be taken and that things should be left alone. Everything is working just fine the way it is.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 943 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 17:06:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear nps,

I have been on the riverways in the ozarks since I was a little child and that has been passed down through generations in my family. My grandfather was a river guide on the current back in the early 1900s and even has a picture in the nps building at big springs park. I have enjoyed hunting and fishing and trail riding my entire life and it has made me who I am today. I want my children to have the same opportunities in the future as I have had in the past. Please leave this land and the restrictions the way they are and have been. We do not need more restrictions on the riverways or any other places around here. I support the no-action plan 100% along with my entire family. If you all close down accesses and add more restrictions you will be cutting out a part of our lives. Not only is it a big part of our lives around here it is our way of life! This is why I live where I do and I love it here. If I wanted to get booted out of places and have more rules that are not needed I would be living somewhere else. Again I ask for you all to leave everything as it is here and take no action with the future plan. Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 944 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 17:11:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** For years the Park services has been systematically removing the rights of local people from using their streams and land. All in the name of a few people who visit the area once a year. When did it become the right of the minority to control everything. The park services should return back to the people more rights.

This plan closes and less than the rights of local people. When the Ozark riverways was created the local people were told "we take your land so everyone can enjoy it for ever" Well when you take peoples land and give it to others for their benefit that is just wrong. Some might call it stealing. Legally it is eminent domain.

I want clean stream, I enjoy the river. But I want to be able to get on the river and enjoy it. Long ago locals cleaned the river and removed trash left behind by all the drunk people who want more restrictions. NPS stopped this practice and said that the locals could not clean all the cans out.

NPS needs to take this opportunity to return to the local people more rights.

Thanks you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 945 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 17:14:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a Missouri resident, living in the city of Crestwood for 18 years. I attend Lindbergh High School and am enrolled in APES(Advanced Placement Environmental Studies). This class offers many opportunities to go out on field trips and extracurricular activities. While I personally have not attended one of these outings, many of my close classmates have and after every trip I get an earful of how much fun they had.

One trip in particular is a class favorite. Our teacher offers canoeing trips to students on the Ozark River, during which, the students engage in hands on activities and exploring the wildlife around them. From what I hear coming from my classmates they have a wonderful time on the river and wouldn't change a thing. So as their loyal friend I find it necessary to stick up for what they believe is right.

There shouldn't be a change with the Ozark River. If it isn't broken, then don't try to fix it. Who has the right to take away critical learning experiences from knowledge hungry students?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 946 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 17:33:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please highly take into consideration many things before Any of the river ways rules and regulations are changed. Is the river really being damaged? Are the motor regulations really going to change things for the better? Is less people on the river really better for the river and the surrounding areas? I have lived near the Current River my entire life and have and am still operating a business near the Current River. As a river user myself, I am having a hard time seeing where boats with bigger motors are damaging the river. Not only are the boats not damaging the river but most of the boaters I know and see are actually cleaning the river from trash when necessary. Also, a family of 4 or larger will have a lot more trouble navigating the river and this might even make for a dangerous expedition for a large family in some circumstances with a small motor. The rules and regulations are sometimes made by people that are not near or have never even been to the discussed topic. Please take into consideration all the people that live, breath, and enjoy what is being discussed and consider that they are the ones that live there and should know by experience what is good or not good for what they call their home. If something was hurting your home, then wouldn't you want to fix it? The answer is yes. However, if you know it's not then you would leave it alone. Please reconsider changing what doesn't need to be fixed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 947 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 17:34:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** After reviewing the proposed management plans I can only support a "no action" plan at this time. The others seem to infringe upon the rights of the voting public to use a public park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 948 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 17:41:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to see no further restcitions on horsepower. I would like to not see any access points closed. I would like to be able to continue to camp and fish as i have done all of my life on the river. We are charged for park services while we camp, although we are being provided nothing: no trash services, water, and a very unclean bathroom. None of the altrenitives involving restrictions added are in favor for any of the boaters.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 949 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 17:46:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I prefer Alternative A but I think Alternative B is acceptable with one exception. I think that the section on the Current River between Round Spring and Two Rivers should not have motorized access except in the off-season. To allow motorized boats in that section is really disruptive to the experience of enjoying the river when one is in a canoe.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 950 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 17:58:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please don't shut down log yard gravel bar. That is where my family takes me camping. I love that place and all the people there. I have friends and family that live in Ellington and if you close log yard gravel bar they won't have any place to camp.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 951 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 18:01:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I favor Alternative A, which goes the furthest in closing illegal access to the river and minimizes vehicles on the gravel bars. I have canoed the Current River from Baptist Camp down to Pultite many times and have been very frustrated to see trucks parked on the gravel bars about every 20 minutes. This completely destroys the wilderness feeling. This negative impact is far far greater than any frustration caused by the number of rafts on the river or even by moderately noisy people. I have found myself paddling hard to get past a rowdy group of floaters and as soon as I find a peaceful stretch there is a truck parked next to the river. I actually passed an older couple as they drove down to a narrow patch of gravel, got out of their truck, and set their lawn chairs at of edge of the water so they could enjoy the river and I could "enjoy" the view of their truck.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 952    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 18:04:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a floater, but I grew up in the country & understand how folks who live there feel. I favor something in between plan A & B. There are stretches of the river that are just too narrow and twisty for larger outboards or jet motors, but I think a separate category should be made for true trolling motors. I can paddle a canoe or my kayak faster than most trolling motors! In off peak season, I think the whole river should be open to trolling motors. Fishing & gigging is how many locals who are of limited means feed themselves, we should not take that out of their mouths. I'd like larger outboards limited severely in peak season, similar to A. I'm also a fan of horses & would like more horse trails in the wooded areas, but continue limiting where they can cross the river. It fouls the water. Again, between A & B. ATV's I would prefer BANNED ENTIRELY. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 953    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 18:09:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I don't want the nps to restrict boat use or horsepower . My dad and my grandpa both have jet boats and they take me fishing a lot in the summer. If nps puts limits on horsepower they will have to sell their boats and I won't get to go fishing. This makes me very sad.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 954    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 18:13:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been a user of the park area between Round Springs and Two Rivers for over 35 years. Each year I go on a Father-Son float trip (in canoes). Our group is having its 50th anniversary float trip this year. Generally, the Father-Son trip involves between 30 and 50 participants, about equally split among fathers, sons and grand-sons.

I also annually go on a separate Father-Daughter float trip (also canoes), which is a little smaller group (between 20 and 35 people) with a similar mix of people.

Our typical float (for both trips) involves a Friday night on the river at Sinking Creek, then a Saturday float to about Big Spring where we spend the night and have dinner and conversation and then breakfast Sunday morning. On Sunday we float to Two Rivers and arrive for our take out about 2 or 3 pm after a lunch along the way.

It is a tremendous trip for each family that goes and will provide permanent memories for the children and grandchildren.

Our only problem over the years has been the excessive use of power boats by speeding and discourteous locals. They tend to hoard the larger beach areas, are rowdy, with excessive drinking resulting in some pretty bad language, and (except for the fishermen with small motors) have little concern for the canoes we are in.

I like Alternative B as proposed by the park service, but I would support it fully, if you would use the proposed boat motor size from Alternative A for the area between Round Springs and Two Rivers.

If you cannot make that change, then I would only support Alternative A.

Thanks for reading my comments.

Lou Garr

P.S. I am a terrible speller.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 955    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 18:18:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose any more intrusion of the government in controlling our water ways, our resources and park land. However you draft your plans, it still means that the National Park Service is going to grow or

expand...which makes more tax dollars from the U.S. citizens. I oppose all of the plans put forward at this gathering. I do not want any more growth or power given to our government, the National Park Service, EPA or any other entity involved.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 956 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 18:20:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I don't want the nps to close any roads or river accesses. Doing so would limit my hunting and fishing. I think local businesses would suffer.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 957 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 18:23:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I've been reading the plan, and I support Alternative A. It appears to be the option that offers the best protection for the river, and best option for people looking to enjoy the serenity of the river and the environment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 958 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 18:30:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Being a lover of nature, and knowing the value of maintaining healthy ecosystems, I give my full support in the adoption of Alternative A in the GMP. I believe what should occur is that illegal roads be closed and restored to their natural state. Furthermore, the majority of horse trails should be non-accessible, due to the lack of need for them. ATV's should not have nearly as many access points as they do. Designated wilderness areas need to be expanded urgently. I love to visit the riverways and do kayaking and hiking trips. It is hard to really enjoy what the Ozarks have to offer with so many areas within taking so much abuse.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 959 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 18:31:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alternative B. The National Parks Service is responsible to manage its lands and the present state of development and under-management compromises that responsibility. Reducing and designating motorized traffic and horse crossings is critical. The plan looks like an excellent compromise between diverse uses and increases wilderness use and education.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 960 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 18:37:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This hearing is sad. I fear for my safety.  
I like Alt. A. I would to see the riverways protected as much as possible and I feel Alt. A will come close to doing that. There are just too many many people using the Riverway's and now it is a Party River!  
I would like to see the Big Springs area become a Wilderness. At little oover 3000 acreas this can be a very inportent resource for the Riverways.  
Hiking Trails , we need more hiking Trails in the Riverways. I LIKE IDEA of the Current River Trail from Round Springs to Pion  
eer Forest.  
So lets keep the Riverways as Natural as possible.

le over 3000 acers

---

**Correspondence ID:** 961 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 18:47:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I want to thank the Park Service for developing a thoughtful analysis. While adopting Alternative B would be a step forward, I strongly support adoption of Alternative A as it provides much more protections for our rivers. Alternative A:

Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads.

Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings.

Bars vehicle access to gravel bars.

Provides wilderness status to Big Spring.

Missouri's rivers and their water quality are critical to our quality of life and our state's economy. Undesignated horse trails have brought water pollution,, specifically E. coli, to the rivers. Horse trails should be kept far enough away from the rivers to prevent these impacts. Illegal roads and vehicles traversing the rivers and gravel bars produce erosion and sedimentation of streams which harm fish habitat. These areas should be managed for maximum protection of biodiversity,, which form the basis of our quality of life and our state's economy.

Big Spring should be preserved as a wilderness area. I grew up in Southern Indiana, which has its share of beautiful rivers and karst areas. Missouri is blessed with even more pristine rivers and unique geological karst features. Protecting these features is critical to protecting water quality for the benefit of future generations.

Thank you very much for considering these comments.

Andy Knott

---

**Correspondence ID:** 962 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 18:54:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** i belive their should be no change in my opinion i belive the government should be less involved

---

**Correspondence ID:** 963 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 18:55:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I think that there should be no change because Plan A and B is unfair to the people's boat rights.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 964 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 18:56:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am supporting Alternative A for the new management plan.

In particular, I am looking forward to seeing the Big Springs area designated as wilderness. It is so important to preserve these small areas as they are. Once lost there is no getting them back. I have visited several of the existing wilderness areas and plan to visit the rest this year.

Thank you for preparing an excellent analysis for the DGMP and for supporting the Big Springs wilderness proposal.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 965 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 19:46:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No action plan, please.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 966 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 20:10:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE LEAVE IT AS IT IS

---

**Correspondence ID:** 967 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 20:12:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe that the river should be used more often while keeping it pristine. My class goes there on a special field trip once every quarter and I hope to go this semester. I also haven't personally been there at all in my years at lindbergh. I hope that it can be preserved in its original state but will agree to one of the newly proposed plans. Some may want to limit those who're on the river at a time which just causes problems for those that work there. This would also result in loss of appeal to the river with newly imposed regulations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 968 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 20:13:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family and I visit the current and jacks fork and eleven point river all year round we enjoy camping, motor boating and hiking and gigging along the banks of all three rivers. We would like to see no action or change in how we are able to use these amenities. We love the area we live in and stay close to home for vacations and spend ALOT of our free time on Current River.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 969 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 20:50:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I endorse Plan A

---

**Correspondence ID:** 970 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 20:56:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** After review of the management document I am in favor of the no change proposal. Feel the 1984 management plan will fill the needs of NPS for management of ONSR. Also would do no think wilderness area is necessary for this size track of land. At one time access was limited in this area and assume still is. Think this is sufficient without the additional limitation & restrictions of a wilderness area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 971 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 21:22:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I attended the public meeting in Van Buren last night for the Draft General Management Plan of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I was very disappointed to find the meeting was just an open house and there was no open discussion. There were National Park Service personnel on hand to answer questions, but none of them were knowledgeable or well informed of the Plan. I wanted a simple question answered. What 20 access points to the river are they closing and why are they closing them when we need more access to our rivers.

The tone of the open house was, "This Plan shows you what we are going to do to our river and if you have a comment, you can just write it down and place it in the box."

Why is the National Park Service going out of it's way to mislead all of us local folks??? What is really the big picture??? It is no wonder that no one trusts the Federal Government or the National Park Service anymore. We have all been through this before with the "Blueways" System. We will never give up our rivers... All of us folks that live here and grew up here, like our rivers just as they are with no changes. I strongly recommend we take the No-Action Alternative to their Draft General Management Plan.



---

**Correspondence ID:** 972    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 21:26:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The following comments are from some of the NPS most revered documents regarding the Ozarks National Scenic River ways. "They are the most remarkable collection of places in America for recreation and learning." "These are places that offer renewal for the body, the spirit and the mind." "....to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." The Ozarks National Scenic River Ways was intended to be all of these things, but it seems that the NPS in their preferred plan want to eliminate access to only the limited population that enjoys Hiking and Tent Camping. I and my family enjoy the Ozarks National Scenic River Ways as it currently exist, allowing access to those that may not enjoy a two mile hike in order to enjoy the natural beauty and MISSOURI's Rivers. The NPS Preferred Plan seems to lean to the expectations of environmental extremist wanting everything to go back to its most natural state, without the consideration of the recreation and learning of the constituents which the NPS was established to serve. We the voting public needs these resources to renew our body, Spirit and Minds. As for leaving these parks unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations goes, the fact is that the area within the Ozark Scenic River ways has continued to be more and more let go back to nature, including the farms and fields that existed when the park was originally established by eminent domain. So you might say that the NPS has failed to leave these areas unimpaired in a historic sense for recreation and learning. Hunting, camping, boating, and spending time at gravel bars with family and friends has been a part of my heritage and that of our family for generations, the NPS preferred plan would significantly impair or eliminate our use of resources that are owned by all citizens not only the most vocal environmental extremist.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 973    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 21:42:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

My name is Dustin Haynes and i currently reside in Winona, Mo which sits about 10 miles from current river (ONSR). I have resided here in this small country town for thirty years. My ancestors traveled here in the mid 1800's from Ohio and Virginia. It is here that they settled and called home, to which the lands and rivers were a major part of their everyday lives.

In the 1960's many families were forced off the riverways for whatever reason the federal government deemed reasonable. i for one and can speak for many am sick of the governments telling me what i can and cant do. The majority of the people that use these rivers and land from around here are good law abiding citizens. nearly ninety percent of tickets that are written on these rivers are handed to tourist which the park service tend to side with when it comes to the GMP. These types of people that only visit a time or two throughout the year are the real problem. in my opinion i believe the local people do an outstanding job of taking care of the land and river ways. i do not have any problem with the tourist or never have for that matter. However it is very frustrating when it seems as the if the Sierra club is a branch of the NPS. it seems as though these types of people and or organizations have a bigger influence on your decision making than the people who live their everyday lives right here.

once again i have lived here all my life. I have raised my own family here and would like to continue raising my three boys here without being denied access to PUBLIC land. We use this land to hunt, trap and recreation. i work out of town and am gone a lot of times all week away from home. My children ages 7,10 and 12 would rather be on river hunting, trapping, gigging or just boat riding than anything in the world when i come home on the weekends. i would love nothing more than to continue raising my children this way as do many families in this area.

It certainly seems that when you give the government an inch you take a mile. i 100% sport the no action plan and ask that you leave this great land as is. i certainly hope that the NPS takes into consideration how many lives and families of this area will be affected if any other action is taken. "WE THE PEOPLE" are having our freedom stripped away everyday. the least the NPS can do is leave OUR rivers and land alone. let us enjoy what we love the

most.

With all do respect,Sincerly  
Dustin Haynes  
A highly concerned citizen within the ONSR.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 974    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 11:19:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I VOTE for Option "C" to keep things as they are now without changing!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 975    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 11:20:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Having reviewed the plans available I would hope that the NPS would take a No Action Plan since there is no evidence that what is in place is causing harm. The riverways area was cut bald of timber back 100 years ago and came back to a point where it qualified to be considered a national treasure. So the measures in place now would never let the riverways to get damaged to anywhere near that extent. The measures to close off areas and roads,trails,portion of the river and more restriction on all of the above are not in the best interest of the people or the local economy.If the NPS move to Implement more restrictions they will be violating the reason for the NPS existance. The NPS should be allowing more accessiblity to all areas and providing more river access points on upper, middle and lower current river. The Park should also imbrace horseback riding or trailriding by doing what is done at Cades Cove in the great smokey mountain park. the old Tram road should be considered for a actual train ride for those who want to see more of the river without boating,floating,ect. The park use to offer boat rides at the lodge that should be reinstated or sublet to someone who can.The Park is for people, all you have done is try and make it all wilderness so no one can experince it.If you don't want to do the Job the NPS should turn the Scenic Riverways back over to the State so people can actually use the Park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 976    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 11:23:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am sending this comment to plead a no change here on the current river. I spend almost every summer on the river in my boat, on my kayak, tubbing, or fishing. The areas that are proposed for change are not the areas that need to be regulated more. I gig during the winter months on my boat and during the fall use my boat to gig up the trash left behind mostly by people who are here to visit and leave their trash behind. As do the majority of the local families. My family and I put in at the spring and go down so as to avoid the perversion and wild disrespect that happens up river by the people visiting our river. We rarely run into floaters down there so why would the NPS want to further regulate our boats? If you want to do this river, state, national park a favor do something about the disrespectful people who come and throw their trash into our river as if it's not their problem. It seems the NPS is more concerned about the comments of the few who visit and don't like the locals boats, which I would guess is mostly in the four mile stretch that you DO NOT regulate, than preserving the dignity of our river. We have lived here for many generations and would not consider ourselves "friends" of the river but something much more profound, as it is a part of our lives year round. We are the keepers and protectors of this river. The upper parts of the river are so shallow during the "peak season" that boats cannot use it anyway. Restricting it would be banning the people who live on it from using during other times of the year for actives such as fishing and gigging. This is not about people having fun, this is about you making huge changes in our daily lives and the lives of our future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 977    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 11:25:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am strongly opposed to option A, I would prefer that the horsepower regs stay as they are, but if I had to choose, I would go with option B, the NPS preference.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 978 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 11:34:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** After attending several of your informative meetings regarding your proposed General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, I believe the absolute best option is the "NO Action Alternative". The "NO Action" plan is the most beneficial to all those directly affected by the use of the riverways: the local residents, businesses providing services in the area, and all visitors to the ONSR. There are currently sufficient rules and regulations in place to protect the environment and the riverways.

My wife, Shirley, and I have owned a cabin and property on the river south of Doniphan for over 25 years. We, along with friends who also own property along Current River enjoy motoring up to Big Springs, having lunch at the lodge there, and then floating and motoring back. We have done this regularly from spring to fall over the last 10-12 years. What a wonderful way to enjoy the beauty of one of Missouri's natural resources. And much of the river in the Big Springs to Gooseneck area would be seen by very few people if further restrictions were placed on the use of the riverway.

Canoeists, floaters, and boaters currently use the riverway with respect for each other. Occasionally, some canoeists or floaters will get in trouble in the faster areas or where there are root wads, but the boaters are very good about coming to their rescue. Without some of the boats with larger motors, some of these individuals would most likely have drowned before help could be summoned. We personally have a large motor and have helped many individuals in dire circumstances. Additionally, the larger motor at cruising speed creates less wake than most 60/40 motors - which are the proposed limit for this section of the river.

During the summer, there is congestion on the river on the weekends near Van Buren and Doniphan due to the large number of floaters and canoeists that visit the area using the local rentals. Proposing the change in the regulations to eliminate outboard motors on sections of the river will only increase the congestion in the above mentioned areas. And from September 15 through the end of January, new regulations would prevent fish gigging in large portions of the river. Again, this would cause congestion in the areas open to outboards and remove fish from the river in concentrated areas.

Missouri residents are the primary individuals that use the riverways and should have the ability to determine the regulations for the areas that we use. Obviously, we want the river to always be there in its current pristine condition for our own enjoyment and that of our children and grandchildren. With all of the boaters currently using the ONSR, there is very little if any trash left on gravel bars or in the river. What trash is there is caused by canoes overturning, floaters losing items in the river and being unable to retrieve them, and occasionally items blowing out of a boat. But again, there are river clean up days where those using the river regularly will meet and pick up any litter or items that have floated downriver in floods.

After speaking with several hundred people in the meetings that you have held regarding the ONSR, and after listening to our state and national senators and representative on the subject, it appears that the "NO Action" option is the option favored by all. I respectfully request that you adopt this "NO Action" alternative.

Sincerely,  
Ray and Shirley Batton

---

**Correspondence ID:** 979 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 11:51:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** NO ACTION PLAN FOR ME!!! I would like to voice my opinion on the ONSR draft plan for my local rivers and parks. First off my dad was a Park Ranger with you all for 30 plus years. I have nothing against the riversways personally!! As the years have went by new people have moved in here from different states to run our park service. All they can think about is change!! We don't need change!! Whats wrong with the way it is and

has been for many, many years. I grew up and lived in a park service area house on the river. I have enjoyed, swimming, camping, floating, and gigging my entire life. So, why shouldn't I be able to take my grandchildren in my jet boat, to fish, swim, float and to gig!! And to camp on the gravel bars on any part of the river I choose. I believe that the cause of the controversy is because we have the people from other organizations, such as Sierra Club that in their opinion, we are ruining our national resources and polluting the rivers with our jet boats and driving on gravel bars... Some of those people have never even been on our rivers. And some maybe float once a year. That's fine and good. Continue to come here and float, but don't try to change our way of living and the way some make their living here!! Why should they have a say in what happens to our area!! I also own a scag mill in Birch Tree. I cut timber for our business... Those same people want to tell us what we can or can't do with it. That is how I make my living!! I am for the NO ACTION PLAN!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 980 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 11:54:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I grew up on the current river, spending almost every summer day in the water or fishing. But always around the river. Over the last 50 years I've been witness to the changes dealing with the river. I would like it to be pristine as it was in 1957, but that's not going to happen.

The river is for recreation, so tubing and canoeing are popular and has definitely dramatically increased over the years. We locals take care of our river. For example, I always pick up bags of trash left behind by out-of-towners. We even return items that can be identified. As far as damage to the river. There does need to be some rules concerning trash, plant and fauna damage and a number of other things.

As far as boats, they have always existed on the river. There have been many personal experiences where if I had not been there in a boat, people would have died. I can only estimate that my sons and I have rescued hundreds of out-of-towners, both drunk and sober.

We have gig offs to get the beer cans and trash out of the river. In short, don't restrict us when it comes to use of (reasonable) boats on the river. We save lives and clean our river with them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 981 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 11:55:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of the No-Action Alternative for the Ozark Scenic Riverways. Further restricting access to the area will hurt business owners who make their living on the rivers. Outfitters, canoe rentals, motel owners, restaurant owners, gas station owners. All who live in these small towns will be adversely impacted if you curtail access to the beauty of this land. If you make the VanBuren area a wilderness it will lessen the amount of people able to see and enjoy the land. I grew up playing in Jacks Fork River near Alley Spring and Eminence and the last time I saw it near Alley Spring the NPS had ruined the riverbank that I knew as a youngster. The already general management plan provides for the preservation of this area without new and more burdensome guidelines. We do not need more control. Give us freedom to enjoy the area. Please do not control this area more than you already are. Keep this area free. My ancestors settled the area and fought to keep it free. Do not impinge on our liberties anymore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 982 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 12:04:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Don't know of an easy fix for this issue. Van Buren and the other communities in this area rely heavily on tourism. My store maybe not directly but I do sell to customers that make their living from tourism. My wife's restaurant relies heavily on tourism.

I am not sure how many people travel here with their boats or how many travel here to float the river. There are several that live here that boat & float.

I do think the river is too crowded during the weekends. Both boaters and floaters. Don't know how you fix it either.

I do think that the local people should have just as much right to boat as the people that come here to float. I would hate to see boats banned. There are a lot of people that have a lot of money invested in their boat.

My concern is that as hard as it is to find employment here I don't want to see one of the few industries in this area destroyed. I am speaking of the boat manufacturers and the shops that do the finish work on the boats. In the Van Buren / Ellington area that is close to 50 people. That may not sound like a lot of people to some one from a large city but it is big here.

I would like for you to consider the revenue from sales tax also. Where as the tube and other rentals do contribute some to the communities by purchasing items in the county and paying sales tax on those items the actual rental fees are tax exempt. The boater group pays sales and property taxes on their boats, motors, & trailers.

My final thought is that I know of not one single solution but hope a compromise can be reached without letting special interest groups from outside the area decide the outcome for this area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 983    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 12:10:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It is a travesty that you are drawing a hard line against rock climbing. Your perspective seems to be skewed about how damaging and dangerous rock climbing is. Just as an example, check out Jackson Falls in the Shawnee Forest in Southern Illinois. You will see that the climbers keep the area very clean and the horses do far more trail damage than us hikers. And I'd venture to bet that more hiking injuries next to cliffs happen than climbing injuries. That you say climbing can damage the rock shows very little understanding of what kind of rock that climbers use. We don't want to pull on rock that will break any more than you want us to break rocks. We climb on strong, solid walls.

To exclude an activity that has been demonstrated as beneficial and undamaging in other areas is silly. Please reconsider your decision.

Thank you for your time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 984    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Climbing is a legitimate and longstanding use of our nation's public lands. Rock climbing is practiced in many places on our nation's diverse public lands. Throughout our National Park System, as administered by the National Park Service, climbing is considered a "welcomed and historical use." Climbing is also a welcomed and historical use on other agency lands including hundreds of sites managed by the US Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, US Fish & Wildlife Service, and Army Corp of Engineers. At the state and regional level, climbing is equally popular.

The section about "Rock Faces and Bluffs" ends with a determination that, "these restrictions will prevent permanent damage to rock faces or bluffs. Technical climbing can cause rocks or debris to dislodge and fall below, which could cause injury and/or death to visitors who are below." While the determination is true for the actions recommended, it is not the only way to protect the rock faces and the safety of visitors.

Climbing is a low-impact, human-powered, legitimate recreation group with more than 6.5 million annual U.S. participants (Outdoor Industry Association). Climbers give back to their local trail and park systems by volunteering on public land, protecting the environment, and preserving open space. The majority of climbers are responsible, considerate, and safety-conscious.

Restricting rock climbing in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will only limit the extent to which this national treasure is enjoyed.

Please reconsider your restrictions on Rock Climbing in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 985 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 12:32:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am asking you for a NO CHANGE for our area....I have lived here for 21 years and the river is our way of life. We have raised our children on it and to respect it as we do. We always put our boat in below the Spring and find a gravel bar and we are there for the day with family and friends. So for you to change this would be a BIG DEVASTATION for us!!!! We are on the river through out the year fishing, gigging and boating and want to continue to enjoy it. We live here and we the community take care of it, not the tourist that (some) may come in and trash it up. We keep it clean and pick up trash...we always have trash bags in our boat to keep our gravel bar clean!!!!!! As far as boating is concerned...I can't tell you of the numerous times we have had to help floater, and tubers that have turned over and needed help or are lost and need help back to the boat landing!!!!!! So in closing I am asking there be NO CHANGE to our river or boating regulations!!!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 986 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 12:34:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To value one recreation over another is discrimination. To say that an activity is banned is irresponsible to the people. For those of us who choose climbing as a recreation and way of life, this is an affront to our freedoms. Before terminating access to this area consult with the responsible climbers of the area to negotiate a policy of responsible practices and access. Climbers are great stewards of the land, and the bolts serve to protect these individuals in the activity of climbing. You demand PFD's for your boaters and kayakers, so too you would want the same safety regulations for climbers: i.e. The use of fixed hardware. If climbers are a scourge and somehow not worthy of respect, then charge them to climb their own cliffs, but don't banish what you don't understand or participate in to serve a personal agenda.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 987 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 12:36:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like for my family to be able to continue to use the river as we have for several generations. Erosion has occurred for 1000's of years and will continue to occur no matter what department oversees the scenic riverways. Most people around here only see the pollution in the summer months while tourism is highest. The number of boats have very little to no affect on the aquatic ecosystem when compared to the amount of sun block and urine and beer and everything else dumped in the water by tubes and canoes. Please consider these dramatic effects while doing studies on the river system boating causes very little damage compared to the chemicals brought in by tourism and should be infringed on unless you are willing to dramatically reduce the amount of tubes and canoes put in the river each day as well.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 988 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 12:39:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family and I are on Current River every week during the summer. We float, boat, swim, and spend time on the gravel bar. The river is a major part of our lives and always has been. We make sure to take care of the river while there. We always pick up our trash and others as well. We just like to enjoy the wonderful thing that nature has given us. For you to try and put even more restriction on Current River is just absurd. It can be pain enough as it is to keep up with the silly rules now. As anyone can see from visiting the beautiful Current River, it is still very much preserved and well taken care of. All the local people who basically live on the river make sure to keep the river as it is so that it can be enjoyed in the future. Current River is so precious to us and we will always take care of it because of that fact. The system in place now is working just fine. There is no need to change things. I am one hundred percent against this new plan you are trying to pass. If you are not someone that visits this river every weekend, then who are you to try and decide if it needs to have more rule and regulations. I bet those of you who are trying to pass this plan spend much time on the river. So stop meddling in something you have no business interfering with! This land belongs to the state of Missouri and should be supervised by them!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 989 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 12:40:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a concerned local resident of the area that the GMP will affect I would like to see the Plan C- No Action implemented. My family and I use the river year round. Any change in the HP limitations for jet boats would make it tough to get the whole family up and down the river in a boat. The system that is in effect right now is not flawed, the NPS just doesn't have the manpower to enforce the laws that are already in place. What makes you think they can enforce more regulations? The ONSR is already a place that everyone can enjoy. Why limit certain groups from doing so? Any plan other than "No Action" would not be fair.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 990 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 12:40:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I go to Current River all summer long. I go anytime I'm not at work. The river is like a second home to me. I grew up on the river and plan to raise my children on the river. I don't feel that you have the right to try and force us off the river. It is just fine how it is now. It's clean and taken care of. So there is no reason for you to try and come in to take over. Just stick with things you actually know something about and leave the river alone! No one wants you plan! No one as for your involvement!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 991 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 12:41:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hi. My name is Zach. I am 10 years old. My favorite thing about summer is always going to the river. I love to go floating and riding on a boat. I love swimming even more! Please don't make it where I can go to the river and have fun. I promise not to mess it up and to always clean up trash. I just want to be able to go to the river during the summer. I love Current River!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 992 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 12:41:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am against this project. We the local people want to be able to live and use our local land without our rights being taken away from use. We were not given a choice when our land was taken away from us in the 1960's and now you are taking our right to enjoy the river as God gave it to us. If you want to make the river a better place don't take our camping, floating, fishing and boat riding. Control the drinking and drugs. Place a speed limit but not the size of the motors. If you want this area to be classified as wilderness you are taking our lively hoods away from us. Control the outside Park Service people who are transferred here and want to do away with our local heritage and impose their ideas on us. Send them back to their homes and let them impose these changes on their families.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 993 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 12:42:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Leave things the way they are! There is already too much Government control in our lives! I go to the river to enjoy my freedom as an American. I don't trash up the river and I have raised my children to respect the river as well as keep it clean.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 994 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 12:47:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Enforcement, no matter which route is used to better manage ONSR, is crucial, absolutely critical to success.

Therefore, increased staff for monitoring and regulating all activities is necessary.

Establish serious penalties (stand by those and publicize well) and of course make Clear the Regulations/ Rules for each activity.

Plan B with a few changes is my choice, providing the changes and additions listed below are included:

Permit system for equestrians and ATVers and mountain bikers : fees charged and regulations strongly monitored and enforced

Promote Native Plants and Native Fish

No horse camping in the Park

No motorized vehicles on gravel bars

Reduce number of Horse crossings of Rivers

Keep the riparian habitat pure, as well as its natural bottomland. Don't create, enhance the Native! Restore damaged riverbanks by using Mother Nature's pattern.

Continue to guard the wild 3,430 acres near Big Spring and be grooming that jewel for wilderness designation. it will eventually occur! It's our duty!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 995 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 12:50:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The problem is not the boats! It's the drunk and dopey people that invade the natural beauty of the river. I have been on the river several times, and in my experience the boats are a lot more respectful than the drunken heathens you call floaters. If you want to eliminate controversy, why don't you concentrate on limiting the number of floaters that are dumped out on the river? Oh let me guess , you are more concerned about revenue than the river, plain and simple. If it is not broke then do not fix it. If it is broken then look for the real reason that it is broken. Over crowding of the river by floaters for a huge profit for the outfitters. Simple as that!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 996 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 12:55:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am sending this comment to plead a no change here on the current river. I spend almost every summer on the river in my boat, on my kayak, tubing, or fishing. The areas that are proposed for change are not the areas that need to be regulated more. I gig during the winter months on my boat and during the fall use my boat to gig up the trash left behind mostly by people who are here to visit and leave their trash behind. As do the majority of the local families. My family and I put in at the spring and go down so as to avoid the perversion and wild disrespect that happens up river by the people visiting our river. We rarely run into floaters down there so why would the NPS want to further regulate our boats? If you want to do this river, state, national park a favor do something about the disrespectful people who come and throw their trash into our river as if it's not their problem. It seems the NPS is more concerned about the comments of the few who visit and don't like the locals boats, which I would guess is mostly in the four mile stretch that you DO NOT regulate, than preserving the dignity of our river. We have lived here for many generations and would not consider ourselves "friends" of the river but something much more profound, as it is a part of our lives year round. We are the keepers and protectors of this river. The upper parts of the river are so shallow during the "peak season" that boats cannot use it anyway. Restricting it would be banning the people who live on it from using during other times of the year for actives such as fishing and gigging. This is not about people having fun, this is about you making huge changes in our daily lives and the lives of our future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 997 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 12:57:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am requesting NO change in the way we, the people that LIVE in the Current River area, are able to access and use our beautiful Current River!! I would suspect that most of the families living in this area feel the same way.

I LIVE on the Current River in Van Buren, MO. This is a small, clean town on a beautiful, clean, spring-fed river. I spend almost every day during the week playing in the river after work. My children go to the river most days M-F. We, the people in this small town, nurture and clean up the river and the town after the visitors leave. We LOVE our river. We know how to manage our river best and our rights to our river should not be dictated by a bunch of city people that don't even live in our area.

The biggest problems created in our area, Van Buren, on the Current River are created by the one time "visitors" and tube and canoe floaters that come from the cities like St. Louis and Southern Illinois and clutter up the "4 mile" stretch of river, around the town of Van Buren not by the boat owners. This 4 mile problem area isn't even affected about the proposed NPS changes and is the biggest problem. The visitors, not the local folks in boats, are the people that get all drunked up and throw their trash in our rivers... I don't have a boat but I totally support the local people



that do because THEY can get away from the obnoxious "visitors". I can't take my children to the river on weekends when our area is flooded with tourist to enjoy a nice, quiet time due to the disrespectful out of town people that access our river from the cities elsewhere. RARELY do I see a local act the way the drunken city visitors do from misbehaving, loud cussing, having sex in daylight on the river banks, flashing their boobs, to throwing their trash in our river... If it weren't for the boats on the river more of the drunken tourists would drown and keep in mind that it's the boats that clean up the river after the tourists have left for the summer season. SO many of the people that live here and have boats can tell you of numerous stories about how they, in their BOATS, have pulled drunks out of the river that were drowning.... SERIOUSLY, and NPS is trying to get the boats off of the river???

I take my children to the Current River almost every day in the summer, except Saturdays & Sundays due to the drunken, rude tourists. Now I know that not every person that comes to this area falls in that category but the majority do. If NPS \*really\* wants to "clean this river up" then perhaps getting rid of the drunken tubers would be a "real" place to start. Also, we like to camp and in a "real" way... we want to be able to camp on gravel bars not shoved into national park campgrounds where there is another tent 6' from ours and where we have to pay to camp ..... That's ridiculous. DO NOT take our gravel bars from us.

The point is, it appears that NPS & some folks from the city want to make decisions and changes for OUR (the people that LIVE here) river and land based on comments from people that do not even live in the Current River area but only visit here perhaps once a year. ... this seems ridiculous. Why should people living in other cities, specifically St. Louis, have any input, with their limited knowledge of the day to day life, here, of how the Current River should be managed? It seems we have no input on how the St. Louis folks should manage their Arch park, nor do I care what they do with it, so why should people in St. Louis have any jurisdiction on the Current River area??? Ultimately we, the people that live in the proposed change area, are the ones that take care of our river and live here year round and ultimately it seems to me that since WE are the people that cherish and take care of our river that WE are the only ones that should be making decisions for this area and WE don't want any changes except to get the drunken tourists out of here.

My family settled Carter County. They have lived on or close to the Current River for well over 100 years. We are not just "friends" of the river, we are the full time caretakers, keepers, and protectors. We understand the river and how "she" flows and we see the lives, both human and animal, that are "supported" by our river....

Restricting the river by the NPS proposals is inappropriate and unfair. I VOTE NO to all of the NPS proposals!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 998    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 13:05:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep the river as it is.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 999    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 13:07:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** You don't need to change anything about our parks. These parks belong to the people, not the park service or the government. We have lived in this area most of our lives and enjoy the river. We don't need anyone telling us how or when we can use it. Why is the government constantly trying to interfere in our lives and business. They are not the best ones to try to run our rivers. Just look at the mess they have made of our country in the last 20 years. Let the people in the area have say over their rivers and parks, they know better than anyone in the park service or government what is best for this area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1000    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 13:09:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To: Superintendent Black and the National Park Service

#### Summary

I support the "No Action" plan. If the Preferred Plan is adopted, the "no motorized boats year-round" sections of both Current and Jacks Fork rivers should be altered to allow, at a minimum, trolling motors, and ideally 25 hp

motors in the off-season. I do not support the wilderness designation.

#### Specifics

Thank you to the National Park Service employees who talked with me at the Van Buren, Missouri, public meeting. They were gracious and informative in a stressful situation. My family has lived on the Current and Jacks Fork rivers since 1850, and I understand the emotion involved on the part of other local residents when we feel that access is being taken from us. The rivers are our lifeblood, and I'm not talking about economics. I also understand that our beloved rivers are within a national park and must be managed by outsiders. I appreciate it when those outsiders treat us with respect when they meet us face-to-face.

Regarding the Ozark National Scenic Riverways draft management plan, first I would like to state my overwhelming preference for the "No Action" plan. The Park Service has managed the park competently under the current plan for many years. I understand that this is a national park and must be managed to accommodate all visitors. However, as a life-long resident of the area, and one whose world revolves around the culture and life defined by the Jack's Fork and Current rivers, I see no reason to change a plan that works for both visitors and locals. You have achieved a difficult balance, and I can't imagine why so much work is being invested in trying to upset that balance.

That being said, if the Park Service feels the need to change the management plan to cater to non-local visitors, the Preferred Plan B could be adjusted slightly so that it is not a blatant slap in the face to those of us who carry the rivers in our souls. We don't just visit these rivers; we live these rivers and they live in us. The people who live here make an active choice to forgo economic opportunities, educational opportunities, entertainment opportunities, and all the "status" that accompanies wealth and power. We live here because the land, the rivers, and the culture are worth more to us than status, more than money, more than power.

The fact is, though, that, if the Preferred Plan is adopted, local residents would continue to cede our precious rivers to the rowdy summer weekend visitors in return for their modest economic offerings. In fairness for this sacrifice, it would behoove the Park Service to modify the plan slightly to allow us to enjoy the rivers' quiet majesty and replenishing beauty in less-trafficked areas and in the off season. SPECIFICALLY, the sections of both the Current and Jacks Fork rivers designated in the plan as "no motorized boats year-round" needs to be altered to allow, at a minimum, trolling motors year-round. As an example of this need, my son, who was raised on the Jacks Fork river like the 7 generations before him, is 6'6". Do you know how "tippy" a canoe is when you are that tall? To have an enjoyable float, he must ride in a small johnboat. Do you know how difficult it is to paddle a johnboat? He uses a trolling motor for slow holes and to control the boat while he fishes. A trolling motor doesn't make noise. It doesn't make waves. Why deny my son enjoyment of the river, all for the use of a quiet trolling motor?

It would also be sensible, and a nod of respect to the local population, to allow small motors (25hp) on the upper rivers during the off-season when park visitors are few and far between. We could continue to enjoy legacies such as gigging at a time of the year when park visitors will not be offended by the noise.

Now, regarding the wilderness study: seriously, if the 16,277-acre Irish Wilderness isn't enough foot-traffic-only land for area visitors, another 3,430 acres a mere 8 miles away isn't going to help. How many people use the Irish Wilderness each year? The figure I found is 400-700. That's about 23 acres per visitor in a busy year. That's all the wilderness we need, thank you very much! I do not support the request for a wilderness designation.

Submitted respectfully,  
Mary Kay Nicholson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1001	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,23,2014 13:17:11				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Thank you for the post card mentioning the comment period and public meetings. After reviewing the Draft General Management Plan we are strongly in favor of Alternative B, the recommended plan. We have floated the National Scenic rivers since 1971, and continue to do so. We urge the National Park Service to protect water quality and other natural resources in the park. At the same time, we appreciate having the recreational opportunities that the Ozark Scenic Riverways offer and we know others enjoy this too. Alternative B seems to address these issues well. Plus, it includes mountain biking, which is another good way for people to enjoy public

lands when trails are properly constructed. This was a very thorough study, and the National Park Service staff are doing a great job. We very much enjoyed floating last summer and our grandchildren want to go back!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1002    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 13:25:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I attended the mtg.in Kirkwood and after hearing all of the statements made by various individuals, I wondered how many of those people had ever been involved on a volunteer basis to actually help maintain a Wilderness Area. There is so much that a lot of people are unaware of about the upkeep of such an area, both in time and money and dealing with restrictions in same areas. I'm assuming that the same restrictions would apply to any newly designated Wilderness Area. How could the parks dept. possibly keep up with continuous maintenance - providing there is still access for trail users ( hikers and horseback riders)?

I visit this area several times a year and have for 30 years or better. What I find most offensive are the riverside camping areas that left with litter and offal during the spring and summer month especially. Why are these areas not monitored and fines levied if necessary to cut down on this abuse?? It's all left in plain sight!! And if areas like this are not capable of being controlled how can anymore areas possibly be taken care of??

I think I'd have to agree to "no change" in designated area, but an increase in staff, if at all possible, to maintain the status quo. Thank you. Ellen H

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1003    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 13:25:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Plan A. I believe we should return the river to its natural state. More limited use by outfitters and little or no motor traffic.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1004    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 13:27:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO CHANGE

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1005    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 13:42:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As an avid rock climber I feel compelled to suggest that blocking all technically rock climbing is an unnecessary move, simply because the area under consideration sees very little traffic compared to other more popular rock faces.

These rock faces see thousands of visitors each year and very little damage is done to the rock.

Everybody has their favorite outdoor activity and simply because somebody doesn't like rock climbers does not give them the right to block access. This country already has enough problems with obesity as it is, taking away opportunities for people to get outside and utilize nature to become healthier is a step in the wrong direction.

If there are liability issues for injury on the land where the rock face are located, those issues are draconian and stand out in a national context when it comes to public accessibility to rock faces.

There are many well-funded interest groups who will use their power to keep this rock face accessible to the public, who funds it's very upkeep and existence.

Save yourselves the trouble and allow adults to make their own decisions about the sport they love. The last thing 99% of rock climbers want to do is destroy their precious climbs, which some takes years establishing. The other 1% will do what they want, regardless of what arbitrary laws say.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1006    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 13:54:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern; I grew up climbing with my father all over the country. Some of our favorite places to climb include (southern) Illinois, Arkansas, and the ever scenic river ways of Missouri. I remember my first climbing experience was on the current river. I had seen a group of people scaling one of the bluffs and was amazed that people could do that! My father, seeing that I was completely in awe, asked me if I wanted to learn how to climb like that. The rest is now history! Over last 15 years Missouri has become a very "anti-climbing" state. Many of it's state parks and wilderness areas are filled with beautiful bluffs that offer some of the best climbing the state has to offer! Unfortunately however, it is now illegal to climb in all but a few of them. It pains me to see other states in the midwest keeping climbing areas open and available to the public at no cost to the park service. They are simply just another national forest or state park that happens to allow climbing. (All bolting is climber maintained and there is a strict code of ethics among climbers pertaining to safe bolting and the use of natural protection.)It would truly be a shame to lose some of the last great climbing areas in Missouri, especially one that has so much value to the local climbing community.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1007 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 14:04:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In regards to the Ozark National Scenic Waterway National Park Sevice Draft Management Plan. My vote is for the "do nothing" alternative. Preferably giving the land back to the State of Missouri.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1008 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 14:25:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family and I have spent most of our life on current river andbusing our boat to enjoy it. It is a way of life for people that live here. Please do not make any more changes concerning boats. Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1009 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 14:33:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support NO ACTION- -plan D

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1010 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 14:36:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a resident of Carter County Missouri who's family lives along and has enjoyed boating on Current River for many generations.

My recommendation is to adopt the "No Action Plan" as it best follows the spirit and original intent of Missouri legislature giving title

And management of Jacks Fork and large portion of Current River to US Department of Interior

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1011 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 14:38:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I grew up in Van Buren (1972-1989) and fully understand the culture of the town, region and the importance the people put in the Current River. I have used the river before and after the concessionaires opened the river to shuttle service. I now live 45 minutes from Van Buren in Mountain View. I understand that with time comes change and I support change when needed and also when problems have been identified. I have read the GMP and agree with most parts under the less restrictive use options of "no action", "B", and "C". I have a 60/40 jet motor and use the current river year round within my HP restriction areas comfortably. My main use is on the weekend with my family and choose weekdays only to fish. I agree with the current HP restrictions and alternative B or C because I feel they are in place for user safety whether people realize it or not. I have operated all HP boats on the river and know exactly what is needed to use the river under many different circumstances. In general, the smaller the river channel the lower the HP to slow down the boats. The same, the smaller the channel then less the number of non-motorize use for safety and comfort of use. I feel a lower number of tubes and canoes in the upper sections will help in having the people that chose to use the river to get the maximum solitude they are looking for in

that mode of transportation. If I choose to use the upper sections of the two rivers as I get older, paddling a canoe will not be an option due to health reasons. I will need some type of motorized vessel to get around on the river as will most elderly users. I may need a canoe with an electric motor. I agree that we need to stop unauthorized roads to gravel bars. I agree that we need to limit in some way the number of canoes and tubes. I do not wish to subject my family to drunken parties and foul language or rude/lewd behavior that some partake in even in the gaps. I would agree with more law enforcement in high use areas. My input for selection of alternative plans 1st alternative C then 2nd Alternative B.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1012 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 14:45:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We have lived within a mile from Current river for our entire lives. We've raised our children to enjoy and respect it as our parents did us. We would like to continue using and loving this wonderful area for generations to come. Please don't change what we know and love. We don't race our boat up and down the river...ever! We put in and stay below the spring, find a gravel bar and enjoy our day with other families.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1013 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 14:48:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No Action Alternative! Please do not make changes to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. We love our boating, fishing, and fish gigging and we wish to support the local businesses and communities who depend upon the waterways for commerce and industry.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1014 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 15:14:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO CHANGE!!!!I've lived here all my life and have never heard the line of crap that the big city bs people are trying to control over the local people in this area. we are calm loving people in this area and will help anybody in need but just to come in and rip all that from us is horrible. If you want to talk about pollution on the river look at the canoes that dump all their trash that we pick up every year at the end of the season. I could go on and on but I'm not a radical person nor have the resources (MONEY!) like a lot of the big city parasites.  
concerned local Lance Grandstaff

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1015 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 15:17:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** to me a 40 horse jet with 4 grown ups and a cooler is not big enough on the current river , very unsafe going up stream , not enough horse's

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1016 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 15:35:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a life long resident of Carter County (52 years) I have seen many changes to our beautiful area, some good and some not so good, changing or restricting motorboat use on Current River I fear would be a bad change. Why you say? Well I saw what the river looked like before it became a tourist attraction to tubers, canoeists and kayakers, it was a beautiful trash free waterway. We had many boaters before the tourist came and trash wasn't a problem. We local boaters take pride in the river, we try to clean up what tubers throw in the river, we even on occasion pull a tuber out of the river, when they are drowning. Boaters are not the problem, and any change to the current plan would be a bad thing.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1017 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 15:45:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to see the implementation of alternative plan A. I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this process. The decision we make now will affect generations to come and should be done thoughtfully. Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1018    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 15:51:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family, friends and I have been traveling each year to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways "neck of the woods" since discovering them in 2007. We come to enjoy your scenic rivers and the fishing opportunities and camaraderie they provide as a way to escape from our daily lives and to connect with each other like we have never been able to do before. Your rivers rejuvenate our souls and recharge us ~ enhancing our quality of life experiences.

I support the ALTERNATIVE C Management Strategy as I understand NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE is no longer an option. My family, friends and I have ALL have been pleased with our yearly experience there and feel that there is no need to make drastic changes in the regulations. Our jet boats compliment the naturally flowing rivers and make accessing the rivers so much easier, which is becoming more important as we all age..

Thank you for honoring my wish for a ALTERNATIVE C Management Strategy Option so that we ALL may continue to come, to experience and to benefit from the rivers which make up the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

-Roy Hawk - TN

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1019    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 16:04:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear ONSR Staff,

I appreciate your careful analysis of conditions on Ozark National Scenic Riverways and the gathering of input from diverse stakeholders. Alternatives A and B propose many improvements and protections for the resources, as well as proposals to correct abuses under the current plan. I understand more specific road closures and horse trail rerouting will be examined later and probably be subjected to EA's and EIS's.

Although alternative B contains many positive proposals, I recommend a few more inclusive protections proposed in A:

- 1.Close all illegal roads and restore natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads. I have seen ORV traffic IN the Current River. Illegal and legal river crossings need to be indicated. Closing illegal roads and limiting access would discourage illegal ORV traffic and hopefully minimize need for enforcement.
- 2.Close 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and add no new stream crossings. Horses need to be kept away from sensitive vegetation and areas near streams where they contribute to erosion. Provisions need to be made for maintaining equestrian trails, especially on shared trail where rutting and horse excrement hamper hiking. Equestrians need to have input into trail designation and have some responsibility for maintaining them, like the Ozark Trail organization.
- 3.Vehicles should be banned from gravel bars to limit damage to the river, to discourage illegal roads and create a less polluted river experience.
- 4.Since Big Spring is already managed for wilderness characteristics, I support continued preservation until the Big Springs area is legally declared Wilderness. However, I support management techniques to preserve the original characteristics: invasive species removal, introduction of prescribed burns, etc. Without such provisions the natural area may lose its former diversity as a result of existing degrading intrusion. Wilderness designation minimizes human intrusion and therefore, I think, make them easier to manage than areas in ONSR that get more public traffic. These wilderness areas are small bits of natural history.

I immerse myself in the ONSR ecosystems: hiking, trail building, canoing, camping, observing nature, art- -low impact use. I am particularly familiar with the streams and watersheds around Powder Mill, near the Pioneer Forest, Blue Spring, Round Spring, Klempzig Mill, and Alley Spring, but I have canoed the upper Jacks Fork as well. With appropriate management and enforcement, I trust that many diverse users can appreciate the resource into the future.

Sincerely,

Leslie Lihou

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1020    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 16:15:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe the "No Action" is the way to go with this, We the people who use these waterways are doing just fine. We arnt giving anymore control away. N.P.S. & U.S.A.C.E. already has taken too much. property 300 foot above the Dam is crazy,and there are lots of places that you have done this, it will never flood that high, but you still want us to trust you're judgment. yes government just needs to butt out.

Thank you,  
Barbara Bergan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1021    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 16:25:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a resident of Reynolds County, I would recommend and favor the NO ACTION PLAN. As a longtime member and President of the Reynolds County Saddle Club, I would also recommend and favor the NO ACTION PLAN.

I have boated, floated and ridden in the ONSR for many years and strongly oppose any unwanted intrusion from the National Park Service.

In my opinion, it is not the management plans put forth by the NPS that has kept the ONSR in the condition that it is today. In my opinion, it is the heritage, traditions, and pride of the local communities that manage this area more effectively.

David Pogue

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1022    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 16:45:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family was born and raised enjoying these rivers. I spent time every summer as a child swimming and playing in these waters. They are beautiful crystal clear rivers. Most have never had the privilege to see a clear river. We camped along the Jacks Fork River often. I have nothing but wonderful memories from those times. I have shared those stories with my children.

Then I married into a family that was raised on Current River and learned the enjoyment of boating. We have the utmost respect for the water and all of those that use it. There is nothing wrong with the way people are using it today. Nothing beats a warm afternoon boat ride down the river. Then a picnic lunch with friends and family on the river bank. Watching the little ones laughing and playing in the water or sand. Or taking a dip in the water yourself to cool off. It is a family heritage and a God given right that should continue for generations to come.

I can see no purpose in making any changes or restrictions to the way things are done on these rivers. I believe they were created to be enjoyed and not just looked at. May you take into consideration that those who live on the river and use it know more and care more about it than those who desire to take all rights to use it away.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1023    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 16:53:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please no changes the river is a way of life around here no change

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1024    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 16:57:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Living nearly my whole life near Current River, I am hoping that NO CHANGES will be made!!! My parents raised me and my sisters camping and visiting current river for 40years!! And we raised our children on current river and they take their children. I am totally against these changes, and am hoping elected

officials can stop this!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1025    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 17:01:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We are very much against this plan by the NPS!!! Please do not take our rights away from our River that we loved and taken care for so long!! Please leave things the way they are!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1026    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 17:03:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am hoping the NPS does not makes these changes to our Current River area!!! Please someone put a stop to this!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1027    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 17:08:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** None of the plans you propose are acceptable for the Ozarks National Scenic Riverway. Each of A, B and C options will destroy the local economy which is already depressed. Each of those options would also inhibit the culture of river and park use that generations of families have enjoyed here in the Ozarks. The only viable option you've provided is "no change" at all. The best option, based on the poor management practices and wasted tax dollars of the NPS, is for Missouri to take back ownership and management of the park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1028    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 17:20:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Why would you want to shut down the river to jet boats. Family's has been on the river for years in boats. By shutting down the river you will be hurting a lot of buisness and people. Why can't you take a stand instead of letting the sierra club make all the decisions for you. We all live locally around current river not you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1029    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 17:27:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I beleive the regulations that are pertaining to the river should be left as is-NO CHANGE. This is the only form of recreation we have in this area. Most tourists that come to this area have many other forms of recreation available to them, for example, water parks, ballgames, museums, operas, etc.

Many local boat owners have helped to save floaters/tubers from property loss and possible drownings. This would not be possible if they were banned from the river.

We and the majority of local residents would like to keep the regulations of the river as is- NO CHANGE.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1030    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 17:43:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I vote for C

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1031    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 17:44:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please leave the current river unchanged, we like it the way it is. Something else to consider is what the change would do to the livelihood of the business people in this areas if you make these changes.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1032    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 17:44:38



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe we need some assistance in regulating the horsepower and/or type of watercraft is used on Current River but, to close portions entirely to outboard motors is not a good solution at all!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1033 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 17:59:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Iam against any changes that restrict access to the riverways and would like to see the riverways go back to state control!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1034 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 18:03:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not exclude climbing in the management plan for this area. climbing is a major source of tourist dollars for the communities surrounding climbing areas and climbing can be done with respect to the ecological communities and other visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1035 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 18:07:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have read the three proposals and although none are exactly like I would prefer, Plan B (Preferred Plan) is the best plan that would (in my opinion) fill the needs of the greatest number of people using the park. I would love more enforcement in the park of the present rules and less catering to those who would destroy our natural resources. I am a horseback rider, boater and kayaker. The boats ripping up and down the river are dangerous and detract from the beauty of the scenery. Those that wish to experience the river in high powered boats and with drunken behavior should be confined to the small section around Van Buren. The rest of the park should be kept pristine with minimal impact from all users. Cross Country Trail Ride in Eminence should pay \$20,000 a year for a usage permit and be fined \$1000 for every time they lead their rides onto Park property off the designated trails, making trails of their own. However, I understand why this is happening. The current trails are 80% road riding. This is the lazy man's trails and do not give the rider access to the beauty of the park. That is why they make their own trails. I believe designating some of the most scenic exiting trails in the Upper Current Area is very important. Having a Wrangler Camp where horse people, who do not want to "party hearty" can camp and ride in the park with their family is necessary. I think low horse-power motor boats are fine. Big engine, fast lake boats are not. Drunken behavior and cursing are not. I love the idea of a designated Wilderness Area to ride in. Go with Plan B and beef up the enforcement.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1036 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 18:12:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The current management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) is working well. Missourians love and respect the natural beauty of the state we call home. We take care of our natural resources and value our freedom to enjoy these.

The No Action Alternative grants Missourians the most freedom in using and enjoying the ONSR. The other plans would eliminate equestrian trails, put restrictions on the allowed horsepower of boats on the rivers, and severely limit where and how the public can use this park. In turn, businesses would be devastated.

Do not make changes to the plan that is currently working very well.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1037 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 18:43:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Ozarks National Scenic Riverways has been a family recreational spot for our family for generations. By limiting the access to certain areas, many families would not be able to enjoy the natural environment that God created.

Walking long distances to be able to get to the water banks may be impossible for some. Many people may have

handicaps, are confined to wheelchairs and may have illnesses prevent them from easily traveling to recreational areas.

Restrictions should NOT be placed on access to and from, nor should the general public not be allowed to enjoy the natural habitat.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1038    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 18:51:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I propose and support the No action alternative.

Regarding the wilderness issue, I don't think any of the areas you are proposing for Wilderness status would meet the original criteria for Wilderness. Currently vast areas of our public land are in designated wilderness areas and today additional vast areas are being managed as Wilderness even though they don't qualify. Large areas are also designated as National Monuments by presidents without Congressional Approval. In all too much public property tied up so that it restricts access and use by the public. Mention was made of no hunting in the proposed Big Springs Wilderness and these restrictions are present in other Wilderness areas. I am not in favor of more Wilderness areas or non Wilderness areas being managed as Wilderness areas.

I am in favor of keeping access, river crossings, and drive in camping on gravel bars open.

A significant amount of the old road/trail network in the area has already been closed. Many of the road and trails that make up the old network are historic in nature and may date back to early Native Americans and game trails. They are also important to the history of the early settlement and economy of the area.

I think it is important to allow dual sport motorcycles, and ATV's access to more than just the County Roads as long as they are used in responsible ways.

I had intended to attend the Salem Open house and meeting on this General Plan. It was postponed a couple of times and although I had called in and requested information by email I was unaware of the most recent meeting date and missed it. I found information on these meetings hard to find on your website. Also, few people in our community take the Rolla, Salem, or Ironton papers as these towns are 30 or more miles away. As a result we are often uninformed about these issues and meetings. This is true, even though we live within less than 50 miles of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. We do have a local weekly newspaper that is widely read, the Quad County Star. It seems that announcements for these meetings would be posted in it.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I have many memories of the great times I have had on the rivers and nearby, canoeing, fishing, camping, hunting, and exploring the back roads.

Sincerely,

Robert Dunn

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1039    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 18:58:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I just would like for people to leave things the way they are people having been using and taking care of the river for longer than there has been a park service and it remained nice why would anyone think it needs more restrictions when we use it now and it is still nice think about that before you think you need to so called help out there are hidden agenda and people and buisness will suffer!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1040    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 19:25:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Let the land owners vote/decide, not people that don't live near/or own property in county

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1041    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 19:25:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** While I could write a 35,000 word essay on my position I doubt that my opinion on the matter is of much interest to the NPS. My vote on the issue, if that is what this comment box represents, is to leave Current River exactly as it is now and change nothing.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1042 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 19:51:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am strongly against any horsepower restrictions on current river

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1043 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 20:11:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I urge NPS to adopt the "No Action" management plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

I have canoed and kayaked the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers many times over the past forty years. Although I am not a powerboat operator, I respect the right of those people to use the rivers, as long as they respect the safety of paddle-boaters.

I do not endorse the closure of existing equestrian trails. Horse and mule trails have been a part of the native Ozark culture for a couple of hundred years, and this attempt to limit equestrian access is yet another encroachment on local lifestyle and rights.

Nor do I endorse the closure of so-called "illegal access roads". These roads are also part of the local "infrastructure", and any attempt to limit them is an encroachment by "big government" on the local people and their enjoyment of the rivers.

I do not support the massive increase in staffing or infrastructure in plans A, B, and C. Current manpower is adequate. As a taxpayer, I see this as yet another unnecessary expenditure and an expansion of government.

I do not support the proposed limitation on "gravel bar camping". Some of the best experiences I've had on the river while floating involved setting up a pup tent on a "mini-island" with my sons. If the intent is to limit camping to designated "canoe parking lots" in "approved landings", one might as well pitch a tent at a KOA. The adventure of camping out in remote spots on the rivers is a part of the romance of the streams. To limit this opportunity is to institutionalize and sanitize the floating experience in the name of Big Brother.

For the above reasons, I ask the NPS to only adopt the "No Action" option of the four tendered management plans.

Sincerely,

William (Bill) Mount

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1044 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 20:12:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I grew up near the Current. I remember when the land was taken from the residents along the river. It was not a good time. Homes and farm equipment was destroyed, then 25 years later, you paid big bucks to ship in farm equipment from out of state to display at your celebration. Silly. I do not believe any changes should be made to the current regulations. Right now, I can pull into a primitive campground with my RV, run a generator if needed and have a wonderful time in a serene and quiet place (the campground only has two campsites). If you take out the road, I won't be able to enjoy that anymore. My choices would include: a. stay in the noisy campgrounds where there is a lot of drinking and other pollutants occurring or, b. forget camping on the Current and find a place on another river either in state or out of state. My question has always been, "Why are certain areas not restricted at all? Take the Doniphan area for instance, why did they not have to be forced to be a part of the Ozark National

Scenic Riverways?" Well, that's politics for you; obviously, there were more politicians living in that area who had more pull. The little guys have to pay, not the big guys. And that is what is happening here. By the way, just a little way from the primitive campground I stay at is a cabin that is used by the park service only. Will that be taken away from your administrative employees???? I think not.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1045 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 20:20:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mountain biking is becoming an increasing popular activity in Missouri, is attractive for tourists and visitors, and is often a good way to enjoy Missouri's outdoors.

We strongly endorse and support the movement to allow mountain bike use on trails where it is appropriate. We believe mountain biking has an appropriate place within in these areas on on these trails, and appreciate the National Park Service's work to include mountain biking as an allowed activity where appropriate.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1046 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 20:27:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** While I no longer reside in the area, I grew up in Salem Missouri just 5 miles off the banks of the current river. My parents still live there and I frequent the river many times throughout the year. I have read much of the new management plan and support many of the changes made in plan B of the proposed draft. I worked for the park service in the maintenance department for several summers growing up and have seen first hand the effects that the overuse is having on the river. We have a river that has the potential to be one of greatest fishing, hiking, canoeing, and camping locations in the country yet treat it like a party resort damaging the beautiful nature that it supports. Some form of change must take place to preserve the river for the long run. I love the ideas of new specific horseback trails and hiking trails. Those additions would bring many more people to the area and also allow the land to be prepared and treated properly for those activities. While most people would disagree with me, I believe there should be stricter regulations regarding alcohol consumption on the river and more rules to discourage rowdy and inconsiderate party animals who destroy the river. The current river has the same potential as a place like Yellowstone or glacier national parks has. It is time we start treating it as such.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1047 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 20:40:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It is not right to limit people as to how they can use the river. It is public land for public use. I vote no.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1048 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 21:48:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in favor of option C. I feel this would be a good alternative. Thanks for taking our comments. Sincerely, Michael Duncan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1049 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 22:09:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Leave OUR park as it is....Do Not Close..gravel bars..DO Not close horse trails..Do Not close motor boat access...Do Not change the consession floating..fishing and gigging...hiking trails...accessible trails...mountain bike trails....horse riding and camping....developed camping...gravel bar access...gravel bar camping...backcountry camping....primitive camping or caving...

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1050 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 22:59:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to take the time to comment about ONSR Draft General Management

Plan/Wilderness Study/EIS. Please give careful consideration to the operation of our parks as how they are operated is vital to the local communities. Residents who live in and around the areas where the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers run have found that the rivers and the land around them are a part of their heritage, it is where they grew up, and both are as though they are a part of the family. There is nothing like riding in a motor boat up the river with the wind whipping your face and water spraying on you every now and then or taking the family to the local river for a swimming party on a nice hot day, and there is nothing like pulling your rv to the river and camping on the river bank whether it's just for the weekend or for a week's vacation. There is just no other way to clear your mind of problems and stress of the workplace. God who made this earth put it here for our enjoyment, not for the National Park Service to take it away from us. Before ONSR took over our parks, they were maintained and kept looking nice, now weeds have grown up and taken over forming a wilderness and it is an embarrassment to the local residents to have visitors come to our area. Also, if your plans are only geared to visitors, where does that leave us, the residents in the ONSR? Please at least maintain the No-Action Alternative plan for the sake of the local residents as well as the visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1051    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 06:15:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been a regular visitor to ONSR since 1973. In the 70's I probably visited as many as fifteen times a year. I have fished the upper Current and participated in the horse trail rides from Eminence, but my main activity at ONSR has been canoeing and float camping. I have participated as much as I knew how whenever management plans were developed.

Nowdays I do not visit as often. Maybe I come a couple times a year. I have grown old - soon to be 68 - so I'm not as outdoorsy as I once was. But I still love the place. To me, floating the upper Jacks Fork is as close to a religious experience as I have had. The experience, however, is like the "old gray mare." She ain't what she used to be. Too many roads, too many vehicles, too many gravel bars that now seem like public beaches.

I wholeheartedly support your efforts to update the management plan. Thank you. Thank you for cleaning up the rivers. When I first started visiting there, there were so many beer cans on the river bottoms it was pathetic.

I don't have a big problem with your favored Plan B. It is certainly preferable to C or No Action. I can't help but say that I'd really rather you put Plan A into effect. It's really hard to build new rivers and forests. I'd like to keep as much as we can. Also, I'm very much in favor of the wilderness area near Big Spring.

Please know that you have at least one Missouri redneck on your side.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1052    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 06:21:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to see the Wilderness land returned to the State of Missouri for management. Our group holds a work weekend every spring to do clean up and we would like to volunteer additional hours working with the local people to manage this area. Horseback riding is vital for this rural county in Missouri and I think we could best manage it with local people.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1053    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 06:29:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** None of the 3 proposals are completely appropriate nor seem to have a big impact on preserving our river.

The BOATERS that you want to take the boats from are the local people that live here year round and take care of the RIVER. The boaters pick up the trash that the trashy people that come here from the cities throw in our river. The boats drag the drunken city people from the river when they are too drunk to swim and are drowning or hung up on the roots of trees. The BOATERS serve a valid place in the river community whereas the city people that want to make decisions for our river have NO RIGHT to make decisions about a community that they do not live in nor take care of.

NO CHANGE is my VOTE until there are some appropriate solutions presented.

Least restrictive allows MORE concessioners & this will help preserve the river HOW? One of the biggest problems for our Current River are the concessioners that make big bucks off of our beloved Current River by dumping mass quantities of drunk, trash throwing, foul mouthed city people in our Current River on the weekends all summer. Local folks need their boating rights to be able to get away from the drunks that are tubing in mass quantities down our river dumped in by places like THE LANDing... we need MORE of this? I think not. We need for NPS & groups like "friends of the river"- -who are primarily from ST. LOUIS to leave things the way they are OR, better yet, go away entirely.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1054 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 07:04:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly encourage the adoption of Plan B.

I have canoed, camped and hiked in the Current River area since the 1950s, and have seen many changes, some positive, some not. Plan B will do the most to help mitigate the use practices in the area that have proved and are proving detrimental to the ecological health of this remarkable National Resource, while still allowing for non destructive public use and enjoyment of the resource. Clearly not all uses are without heavy negative impact, and however popular they may be, protection of the resource must be the first and final priority.

Thank you for considering my view.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1055 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 07:14:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a weekender landowner in Carter County and have been boating on the Current River for the last 14 years. I agree with much of the changes proposed in "Alternative B:, except for the following:

There should not be horsepower restrictions below the Big Spring. We own a 150 hp engine and see that most of our friends also own the larger engines. What impresses me is the way the river brings together friends and families together along the gravel bars in the summer. Most of the people down in Van Buren do not have alot of money, boating to a gravel bar to spend the day is affordable and brings the family unit together. I have marveled how wonderful an opportunity the river affords these locals for them to spend time together in nature and away from all the electronics. Please do not take away this simple life's pleasure from all of us.

We respect the river and rarely see floaters below the Big Spring. The larger horsepower boats would not affect nature and floaters in that part of the river.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1056 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 08:48:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My husband and I along with friends have made an annual autumn canoe trip to the Current and Jacks Fork rivers for the last five years. We go during the week to avoid any crowds and we love the solitude and beauty of both rivers. When we run into people, they often are from other states, which tells us we have a real treasure here in Missouri and need to protect it. We support Plan A, also supported by the Sierra Club. In the past, I have canoed on the Current on a Saturday and will never go on a weekend again. We saw drunken college students relieving themselves along the river and crowds of people in canoes and rafts so that we could hardly navigate the river. We have been disturbed by the huge number of horses we have seen along the side of the Jacks Fork and have heard from canoe outfitters what a problem they have become. They pollute the river with fecal matter and silt. We have

also read about the amount of dirt roads and access points to the two rivers that contribute to run off and pollution. Please let's regulate the numbers of people, horses and types of craft on and near the river to restore the natural health of our Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Susan Blandford

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1057 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 08:59:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

I would like to express my reservations about some of the provisions I have heard will be included in new rules that may possibly be put in place on the Current River watershed in the Van Buren, MO area in the coming year. I have heard that horsepower limits for outboard motors will be extended even further downriver than they are at current levels and may also be made even more restrictive. My family has always used the Big Springs, Cataract, and Grubbs access points on the river and would like to continue to do so. I ordered a new boat about a month ago with a 115 horsepower engine before I heard about all of these potential changes in rules. As a public school teacher I am not a wealthy person and it would be prohibitively expensive for me to trade in this new boat and motor to comply with new rules that may be enacted. As with any other new vehicle there is an immediate depreciation hit when anyone takes delivery of a new vehicle. There is no way I can afford to turn around and trade again immediately. I also object to these proposed changes on a philosophical basis. As a person who believes in Libertarian principles I don't believe government should have this much power too negatively affect people's lives. My impression of all this is that it is an attempt to take our rivers away from the people who live here and basically hand it over to the tourist industry and the population from our larger cities. The use of these rivers and the freedom to enjoy them the way we always have is very important to native Ozarkians and it's not right that these traditions should be infringed upon for the benefit of people who don't even live here. The restrictions put on the rivers currently are more than adequate to accommodate the needs of the tourist industry. I will be contacting my congressman and senators with my concerns and urging everyone I know to do the same.

Thanks,

Mark Conway

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1058 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 09:14:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I understand the need to protect our Ozark National Scenic Riverways. My family and I have been attending the Cross Country Trail Ride for over 20 years. It has been a long time summer vacation/tradition for my family. We love to ride horses through the trail system in that area and enjoy floating on the rivers. We have met many friends from all over the US. Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Nebraska, Tennessee, Mississippi, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Iowa, Colorado, and many other states. These people leave their states to enjoy the riding around the two rivers in that area. I know that my family would no longer attend the CCTR rides if we no longer had access to the rivers, roads and trails. My group of friends which we camp with every year averages 25-30 people and travel from Missouri, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Colorado. We respect every aspect of the need to limit the river crossings but love to cross the Current river and ride the trails on the other side. The multitude of trails is what makes that area. Being able to ride as many miles as you want to is a special attraction for me. It is hard to find federal and state land to ride that allows an individual the freedom that this area offers. The ability to travel and start your rides in many different direction is a major attraction. I have been to many other states riding horses, hunting, boating, and camping and there are few places I would return to every year for 20 years.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1059 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 09:25:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My grandmother and grandfather grew up on the current river mostly from owls bend to mouth of rocky...now that they are both gone to be with Jesus..I cherish the time I have spent and listened to them talk about their childhood and growing up there...even spent my own time with them several times ...I wouldn't want to erase or forget those memories. ...now that I am older and have adult children of my own I want to have the opportunity to have this special time with my own grandchildren....by shutting off access and restricting the rivers I don't see that as a possible experience for me or them....nor do I see the reason for this....I am 44 years old and have spent a lot of those years on the riverbanks....my question is "why does this need to change? Everything has worked out well, with no trouble with the way things are and have been all these years?"

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1060    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 09:33:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I favor the No-Action option. My main objection to the other options is their elimination of motor boats on the upper rivers. I don't own a moter boat, I have 3 canoes, and from what I see motor boats are not a serious problem. There are not many people using them on the upper rivers and most users are cosiderate of other river users.

I would like to see a major park visitors' center in Eminence. It is centrally located for the park and would be accessed by more visitors than a center at Van Buren or one of the other park extremities. I suppose this is irrelevant since the alternatives are defined but maybe for the next plan in 20 years....

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1061    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 09:35:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I want to say first that while a lot of people still have animosity toward the park service, I understand that without it most of the land here would be in private or corporate hands and we would not be able to enjoy the rivers and lands the way we do. With that said, I think that the park service should take more interest in the local people and take their input into decision making about the park. People here hunt, fish, gig and use jet boats. The idea of shutting out jet boats or limiting them to 25 hp or 10 hp as suggested by the Sierra Club is just ridiculous. It would in effect mean shutting them out completely because a family of 4 would not be able to get up and down the river. I think the current horse power limits are sufficient.

The park used to have demonstrations at Alley and Powder Mill for whiskey making and black smithing. All that has been taken out. The "museum" upstairs in Alley Mill is outdated and has not been kept up. The park should celebrate local heritage and promote it and have dialogue with the local people rather than give them the impression they are just tolerating them at best or trying to get rid of them at worst. I thing the park should restitute the advisory board that was contemplated in the original enabling legislation. It was only to last 10 years, but I think it should be permanent.

I also want to say that I think the process of the GMP was flawed and did not follow due process. First, it was not advertised or communicated effectively when the first round of comments were submitted. It was not until the first draft came out that we were told that the park was considering shutting boats off the river and closing roads. Then the local people got very active and let their voices be heard and Congressional Representatives got involved. The park then said they were tabling the GMP indefinitely. However, they brought it back to life in full force right after JoAnn Emerson left office and right at deer season, Christmas/New Year and winter weather hit. It was also not right that the Park already says that Alternative B is their preferred plan. That shows that their mind is made up and the meetings are a farce. No real input is being allowed into the plan. Russ Runge said Alternative B is going to be the plan. Also, the park did not initially schedule a meeting in Eminence, one of the largest tourist towns affected by the GMP, and the place the restrictions on Jack's Fork will hurt the most. Instead the park opted for a meeting in Kirkwood, 3 hours away from the river. It was very obvious at the Kirkwood meeting that the people and high school students there wanted to "save the river" but when we spoke to them, they had no idea where Current River was. One guy thought it was in Alton, Illinois!! Or even what the condition of the river was here. He thought it was muddy like the Mississippi! I have never seen a meeting in Eminence or Van Buren to discuss the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial GMP or what you all plan to do in other parks.

In conclusion, I think that you need to consider the local perspective more in drafting the GMP. The horse power limits should not be changed. Roads and River access should not be limited. Camping should continued to be allowed. If you want to make money off of camping, fix up your campgrounds in Round Springs, Alley Springs, Two Rivers and Big Springs. Improve the reservation system there and improve the camp sites and hook ups. Mow the lawn in other places and pick up trash better. Other than that there is no need to fix what is not broken.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1062    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 09:38:27



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Oops! I put the wrong address in the comments I just submitted. If possible, please correct my address to Box 243 instead of Avery Lane.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1063 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 09:38:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I just saw that the document was 534 pages so therefore could not refresh my memory of the details. Being a frequent visitor to this gem of an area I feel a need to give an opinion of preserving this natural setting.

The speeding,loud, boats usually carrying a just as loud boom box SHOULD NOT be above Owls Bend. They are the biggest insult to the purpose of a natural setting. Not as fast,loud,etc craft, with fishing in mind, keep below Round.

The folks that like to park RV's on gravel bars weeks at a time unattended need to be legally towed out. It stuns me to be camping/site seeing down there on a weekend, then back a following Thursday and see the same empty RV sitting there with absolutley no sign of any activity around the area.

I am not a big fan of the horse crowd either but wish there could be a way to accommodate the unfit people and the wanna-be-cowboys in some of theareas just so long as they do not cross the river.

My message sounds self-centered to my abilities probably but being 65, handicapped and can be seen down there walking with crutches, I feel the upper stretches of the two rivers should be preserved and kept sacred to healthier souls desiring to enjoy the quiet and solitude parts like I was capable of years ago. It changed my life and the river still offers me my special places. Thank you for listening.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1064 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 09:45:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Alternative B and urge NPS to focus on eliminating illegal roads and trails, eliminating all access points except those designated by and maintained by NPS, and to curtail horse use- -both in numbers of horses allowed and to restrict horses and riders to designated trails, with the possible exception for off trail use as access to designated Wilderness Areas. That should be by permit only and permits should be limited to no more than 100 horses per year, no duplicate horses or riders, and permits should be issued by lottery.

No matter what the Congressman says- -the people of his district do not own the OZAR and OZAR should not be managed for the profit of "local" businesses.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1065 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 09:45:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My biggest concern with the proposals is the use of any motorized boats above two rivers. That's one of the most congested parts of the Current river on any summer weekend. There is just not enough room to be running up and down the river at unsafe speeds.

It's not the fisherman that are the problem, it's the people just running up and down the river like they are on a road course. I've almost been ran over and have been purposely sprayed by the jet output of a boat just because I was in the way of them running through an area that I was fishing. I have a friend that was in his canoe and was hit by one of them. Not at a speed to do any damage but if it hadn't been for the rest of us yelling and screaming at the driver then I think it would have been a big problem.

I'm not sure what you do. A looks the best to me but I realize you have many different people with many different ideas for what's right. But I think you have to look at what's best for the land and what's safest for the people that enjoy that land.

We used to take a big trip there once a year, spend several days. But nobody wants to go back as long as those river cruisers still run between Round and Two Rivers. Lot's of other places to go that do not have these problems.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1066 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 09:56:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The NPS should run the Park, not the people who own business in the area. I support the preferred alternative in the GMP. Reduce horse use to a level that allows regeneration of the resource to a sustainable level. Reduce roads and traces. Stop designating every 4 wheeler trail that ends in a rat hole trash dump at the river bank as a "primitive campsite". Cap the number of people on the river every day of the year. Sell permits by lottery on line- -not too different from what MDC is doing for duck hunting. No permit, no problem- -we will just confiscate your boat and all the crap in it- -you can have it back right after you pay the fine. That includes commercial operators. The only thing I would exempt would be swimming.

The NPS should not let themselves get distracted from the issues of horse use/abuse, illegal and excessive access points, and commercial overuse. Limiting those things will drastically reduce rowdy behavior.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1067 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 10:26:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support plan A or plan B.

I have enjoyed canoeing on these rivers for many years. The whole area has been the focus of a lot of effort to maintain as a place of retreat and rejuvenation.

Motors on ATV's or power boats are an intrusion and should be excluded. Even horses are too destructive to this environment.

This area attracts visitors from all over Missouri and from all over the US. I think that your focus has been excessively local.

Preserve this area for all future Americans.

Richard Luecke

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1068 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 10:27:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have floated the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers 68 times between 1970 and 2009, about half were overnight trips. My most enjoyable trips were the ones where I saw few other humans, because that is when one is most likely to come around a bend and see a great blue heron gracefully lift up and fly away. Or perhaps float right past a motionless little green heron just a few feet away. Or watch a mink moving along the bank next to my boat for a quarter mile or so. And of course, hear the songs of the Northern Perula, Eastern Wood Pewee and warblers. You won't see a Louisiana Waterthrush bobbing at water's edge when a motorboat is going by.

The worst float trip experience was the time that we were forced by the lateness of the day to stop at a gravel bar that had a road. After setting up our tents and getting our supper ready, several big pick-up trucks arrived. They were as disappointed to see us as we were to see them. They were not rude or threatening, except that they left one of the truck engines running for a long time. We had to get our sleeping granddaughter out of her tent so she would not be asphyxiated.

There are lots of places one can go for wild, drunken parties. There are places more appropriate for motorized recreation and horses than in or along our rivers. The Ozark rivers are unique, special and fragile. The ONSR deserves the greatest possible protection so that our grandchildren can learn to experience nature on its terms without degrading it for those who come behind.

I support Alternative A. Illegal roads and horse trails must be closed. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1069 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 10:33:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Ozark National Scenic Riverways National Park is a place where I enjoy the river and land in various ways. I enjoy hiking, bird watching, canoeing and just getting out into the wilderness where I can't hear any noise from civilization. All of those activities should be valuable and worth preserving for future generations.

I am troubled many times by the illegal horse trails, ATVs driving anywhere they please and motor boats on the river that go way too fast and make way too much noise and risk to human life. The rampant erosion from illegal access points is also troubling.

I believe the NPS GMP should preserve the natural landscape, protect the water quality so the rivers and springs can be enjoyed without worry about bacteria levels or risk to endangered species.

Please do everything that helps sustain ONSR National Park in the way that preserves it for future generations and more sustainable in the short term as well.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1070 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 10:37:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the "No action alternative" for the ONSR.

Thanks,

David Willis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1071 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 10:51:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In reviewing the General Management Plan I strongly support the No Action Alternative. However, understanding that Option B is the preferred plan of the National Park Service I have very carefully reviewed this option. A suggested change to the plan that would make the Upper Jacks Fork more user friendly is to change from a No Motor rule to a seasonal rule or to at least allow electric motors. A seasonal rule with max. 25 HP could be made that would allow those of us that want to fish gig the river in winter to continue to do so. Right now winter use of the Upper Jacks Fork River is almost entirely fish gigging. If a seasonal 25 HP restriction is not allowed then at least electric motors should be allowed. I am a large man and floating in a canoe is not possible. I use a small Jon Boat and an electric trolling motor for floating (I can also use it for gigging). If I cannot use the motor the boat is difficult to steer with just a paddle and I will no longer be able to float the river that I have grown up on and has been a part of my entire life.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1072 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 11:12:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not implement ANY changes to the Ozarks National Scenic Riverways! the purposes changes will be too restrictive and more costly to the local populous than is necessary. we want the horse trails to remain the same in number as they presently are, and to be able to access them without the additional TAX/bridle tag that has been mentioned. the river crossings have already been reduced, so no further reductions should be implemented! these plans are only an additional way for big government to limit the people from enjoying their PUBLIC lands. I vote NO for any further changes to these parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1073 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 11:20:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My objection to your preferred alternative are number one, the restriction of motorboats. I have been running a motorboat on Jacks Fork above Alley since I was in High School. The amount of water in the river limits when you can or cannot run it. During the summer months there are very few times when the water is high

enough, however, when it is, I like to take my grandson fishing in the places that I did when I was his age. We like to stop on small gravel bars and let him swim, catch crawdads, skip rocks or whatever. I also like to use my boat at times while turkey or deer hunting to get to areas that aren't accessible by road. I don't think that the NPS has the right to say that only a part of the people should use the river the way they prefer. We have put up with the bad groups of canoe users all these years but have learned to accept that there are always a few bad apples, I understand that boaters are the same. I don't think all of the rest of us should have to live with a regulation that restricts our hobbies because of this. Thanks,

Doug Conway

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1074    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 11:36:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I vote for no change on our rivers!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1075    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 11:50:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the segments regarding restrictions placed on climbing. The current draft would effectively ban climbing on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.  
Climbing is almost universally allowed in most of the Nations Public spaces. Climbing is widely practiced and encouraged elsewhere in open space lands, whether managed by local government, or by non-profit organization including US Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, US Fish & Wildlife Service, and Army Corp of Engineers.  
Climbing is in actuality very low impact and does not cause significant damage to cliff faces or other aspects of the surrounding environment. The use of bolts on cliff faces is also widely allowed in public spaces. Other park services rather than banning bolting often find a way to regulate it in such a way which benefits both the climbers and the public space. Climbers are generally good stewards of the land. At my local climbing crag the climbing community has significantly helped out the area through efforts such as organized trash pick ups and invasive plant species removals.  
Climbing is a very healthy activity which is a great form of exercise. Personally I have lost over 30 pounds since I started rock climbing. Encouraging outdoors activities such as rock climbing helps reduce the trend towards obesity. It would be a great disappointment and disservice to the public if climbing was restricted as proposed in the current draft.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1076    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 12:05:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** In reviewing the options regarding ONSR, I noticed in one scenario, there would be a ban on motorized boats. In thinking about this, I suspect the real concern is with boats powered by internal combustion engines. They are noisy and disturb the quiet and peace to be enjoyed in nature. They frighten the wild life. They pollute the air and potentially the water as well.

Would the wording in ONSR not better serve the public and nature by prohibiting internal combustion engines and allowing electric powered trolling motors? Electric trolling motors are silent, they are clean, and they are less costly to buy and operate than gasoline powered motors. By allowing them exclusively, it also sends the message that the quiet and peace of our scenic river ways is something of value and is important to protect.

I am not a fisherman, but as a great lover of floating southern Missouri's rivers, I hope you consider the needs of those for whom fishing is a passion as there is a viable compromise that will serve both their needs and ONSR's.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1077    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 12:12:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I think of the Ozark Riverways as a national treasure and can't imagine that it should be managed to allow greater degradation. My preference is for Alt. A but I can support Alt. B as a compromise with those who see it differently.  
Please manage the acreage near Big Spring as wilderness. I think even the locals will come to see that people come to ONSR for a near-wilderness experience. It may be cliché, but some things are worth more than money.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1078    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 12:19:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am fully opposed to the proposed ban on rock climbing / rappelling. The vast majority of rock climbers are very responsible stewards of the environment. Additionally, climbing on existing infrastructure (bolts, anchors, etc.) poses no additional harm to bluffs and cliff faces. A significant portion of park revenue comes from access and camping fees provided by the climbing community. Should rock climbing be forbidden in the Scenic Riverways, surely the park service will suffer a noticeable decrease in annual revenue from usage fees.

A positive and constructive alternative to banning rock climbing would be to work with the Missouri/Arkansas rock climbing community to raise funds for preservation of the riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1079    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 12:30:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am all for protecting our forests and waterways but there is a point when government oversteps. I thought the reason these properties were acquired by the government was for the enjoyment of the American people. As for keeping us from being able to canoe and ride horses in these beautiful areas I think Big Government is stepping on OUR rights. I feel very privileged to be out in the woods on my horse enjoying God's country. It is not something I take for granted. I am a very responsible person and I do not abuse these properties. I am pleading with you to keep these open to our Americans. And what about these communities who rely on the tourism. Government, open your eyes. You are hurting the American people who help pay for your jobs. Who is more important? I hope the American people who should have the right to enjoy these beautiful properties.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1080    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 12:40:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please reconsider the plan to prohibit rock climbing. There are professionals who can install bolts in rock in a safe manner and also people that climb with traditional gear that is not permanent. This is a fantastic way to be in touch with and experience nature in another way. It should not be prohibited. This would negatively impact those who come from around the area to climb and enjoy nature in this way.  
Chris

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1081    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 13:10:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO HORSEPOWER LIMITS FROM BIG SPRINGS TO SOUTHERN BOUNDARY!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1082    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 13:17:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Alternative A for the ONSR Management plan.  
The ONSR should be kept as close to its natural state as possible. More restrictions should be placed on motorized activities, and less roads, especially those which are illegal, should be blocked.

Thanks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1083    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 13:24:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service:

The Current and Jack's Fork Rivers are true jewels of the Missouri outdoors.

The National Park Service General Management Plan to be implemented over the next 20 years, is critically important to the security of this amazing riverway AND the cultural heritage sites that exist within the boundaries of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

I expect to see a strong management plan that protects and preserves these rivers, both for today and for future generations. Specifically, I want the Park Service to adopt a plan that:

- Removes illegal and unauthorized roads that allow excessive vehicle traffic.
- Ends the e. coli contamination in the Jack's Fork River that is caused by excessive horse traffic in the river.
- Enforces scenic easements to stop construction of more buildings along the rivers.
- Restores habitat lost as a result of excessive human activity in the areas/access points noted.

While the natural environment of ONSR has been screaming-out for protection for decades, it doesn't have a voice except through the NPS. Opponents of needed protections are loud but, no more deserving of attention - they have access to many other venues for their recreation; the environment of the ONSR can do nothing but sit and take the abuse. Without the strong management plan, damage will continue to escalate and will, in many instances, lead to irreversable degradation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1084    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 13:26:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My preference is Alternative A. These habitats being discussed are too precious a resource to risk by allowing further development. Alternative A appears to focus more on the preservation of this unique and tremendous resource, along with its rich history...rather than expanding use to other activities that have been demonstrated to be very destructive to the natural habitat.  
Alternative A!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1085    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 13:39:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is not fair. Existing bolts should not be illegal to use and taking away the climbing is absolutely unfair. Why not post warning signs for people going on the trails. Parks should be allowed to be used by everyone including climbers. People walking on the trails don't like when bikers speed by them but your not taking the bikers privalegs away.  
Why not designate a professional route setter to inspect and place the bolts thus creating jobs and stimulating the economy while keeping the parks open for everyone to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1086    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 13:40:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the effort the Park Service has made to construct its Riverways Plan. I do not think that Plan B is sufficient for the long term health of the rivers. I favor the adoption of Plan A. I am particularly concerned about the illegal roads, the horse trails & crossings, and the vehicles that are driving on the gravel bars. I'd also like to see wilderness status designation for Big Spring.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1087    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 13:45:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to see the ozark scenic riverways stay the same or as close to the same as they are right now. I have lived near them my entire life and have never seen the boating effect the river. Of anything the locals help clean the river more than the organisations that are appointed the task. To be honest I don't believe people would be able to safely navigate the river with a 10 hp boat motor or make it back up some of the shoals on the river. The way if they don't have the proper amount of speed the boats won't pick up out of the water enough to clear some of the larger rocks in the river. There are more tourists that do more damage to the rivers by leaving trash and breaking glass on the river banks than the locals. There has been many times that people I know or myself personally have had to clean up after a group of tourists that camped out on the gravel bar, and many times we have helped ones out that missed their boat landing and needed a ride back up river or they flipped a canoe and needed help retrieving their lost items. The tourist believe that the river boats going by them fast causes them to rock and flip over but if we were to slow down when we were approaching them than it would cause a bigger wake and cause them to rock more and they are more likely to flip over then. Myself and many others I know are always very curious to the canoers on the rivers and usually give them the right of way unless it puts ourselves at risk of injury. I believe they should be more educated on our boats and how they work because they have no idea about is or our way of life down here. The last time this river management issue came up there was a woman from st Louis that came down to van Buren and said that they were told that the motor jets was sucking up all the fishing and killing them all. There is no way possible that this could happen. The people that plan on coming down here need to be more educated and be more understanding of the native people in this area. They don't like change in there homes and neither do we. We don't go to where they have been raised at and where they plan on raising their children and say you have had this your whole life and have dreamed of the day you will be able to bring your children and now all you can do is look at it and not really be able to enjoy it for what it is. I really hope that the riverways stay as they are and you realize that the people you are really affecting and hurting are the people that live here and use the riverways all year long. I would also like for you to have someone that can be the voice of the people who live here so you know what we want instead of telling us to shut up and fill out a comment card. At all the meeting people have been to we haven't been able to express our opinion or had any questions answered.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1088    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 14:48:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly prefer the No Action Alternative. The other plans would limit too many of the activities that people who live and visit that area from all over the country enjoy and specifically come to the Current River to participate in. The other problem with some of the plans is that there are businesses in the area that will not survive without allowing the current activities on the river. I have personally been a regular visitor for over 13 years and would be very upset if the activities that are allowed now were to change or discontinue. In addition to all of that, the plans that are being presented seem way too expensive for tax payers without any real benefits to us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1089    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 14:49:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am strongly opposed to the General Management Plan that you have presented. During the summer months I visit the rivers daily. I love to sit in my lawn chair on the river banks and enjoy the great outdoors. Yes, there are times when some people get out of control but over all this is not the case. There are already several laws on the books that could fix the situation of those that are out of control. The rivers should be for all to enjoy and you should not punish the ones who take care of it because you don't want to control the ones who abuse it. It is your responsibility to enforce the current policy. If the current policy was being enforced we would not be having this discussion. Those who abuse the system will continue to abuse it. Making more restrictions will not stop that. You must enforce what is on the books if you want our rivers to be in better shape. More regulations will not do this but will only cause more abuse. Do NOT change what is already in place but leave it AS IT IS.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1090    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 15:28:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support adding bicycle use to certain areas of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways trails system, as appropriate. As an off-road cyclist and trail volunteer, I would like to see cyclists gain access. The cycling community have been very active trail volunteers since the sport began, and have learned to become

excellent stewards to the land and great volunteer partners to land managers. We tend to volunteer where we recreate, meaning that we will take care of the trails that we are granted access to.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1091 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 15:28:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, where it is appropriate in consideration of other uses and where the trails are properly constructed. I appreciate the attention given to and consideration for mountain biking and other trail uses within the General Management Plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1092 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 15:44:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Has there been any consideration of mountain bike trails in the area? The terrain would be ideal and would be a great way for people to get out and enjoy the area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1093 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 16:06:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been on current river since I was born. My dad's family was raised there, and my grandfather owned a sizable farm on the river. That was until the National Park Service forced him to sell and took his family farm. At least, however, we were still allowed to go to the river and experience it with our families. I have such great memories of going to the river with our family and what a great time we all had. My family has always loved and respected current river. We do not litter and participate annually in the river cleanup. I have grown up on the river and I want my children to experience it as well. My kids love going to the river. They would live there in the summer if we would let them. It is always good quality family time when we go. It makes me very sad to think that they may not have the same experiences with current river as I was allowed to have because of the new NPS plan. Our family heritage is there, and I want them to be a part of it. One part of the new plan makes the recommendation that people only be allowed to walk in. What about those who are elderly and disabled? How are they supposed to enjoy the river. I have many family members who would never see the river again if this plan went into effect. I would also like to ask, how are the boats hurting anything? In my experience, the boats have always helped rather than hurt. There have been many times that boats have saved people on tubes and in canoes from drowning or serious injury. Therefore, I propose that no changes be made in the management plan. Please allow us to keep our right to enjoy current river as we always have. Anything else would be devastating to myself and my family.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1094 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 16:30:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please use the "No Action Alternative" concerning Jacks Fork and Current rivers. The public should retain access to these beautiful areas. Plain and simple.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1095 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 17:37:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would very much encourage you to allow mountain bikes on trails in the area. I'm involved with trail development in the Kansas City area and we've had much success implementing environmentally sustainable trail building efforts in forested areas within and near the metropolitan area. We've also had a lot of success allowing access to multiple user types on our trail systems.

The type of cyclist you would likely attract in this area would be a very environmentally conscious individual and would interact very well with other trail users.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1096 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 17:38:23



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to comment on the proposed changes from the NPS to current river. First and foremost, my wife's family has practically lived on current river their entire lives. When I joined this family, I saw how the river was their pride and joy. Going to the river was what they looked forward to every weekend in the summer. Because of their close connection with the river, they treated it as if it was theirs and took care of it as such. One thing I can say is that I have never seen, or been a part of, anything that would harm the river. In fact, we always participate in the river clean up and pick up any debris found when on the river. I have seen many times when people in canoes that camp on the river bank will leave trash or we will find trash from their canoe trips in the river. I have grown to love current river. I love to fish and take my wife and kids their to enjoy a great time as a family. It would be a shame if my children never got to experience the river like we have. I don't feel as though the boats are the problem. I feel like the people who come to the river from out of town are the problem. They don't take any pride in it since they are just visiting and they leave it a mess. These same people are the ones who want to get the boats off the river since we don't let them enjoy the river in it's "wild" state. What I want to say to those who want our river shut down is that we didn't come to your city and tell you how to handle your resources. You can destroy all the land, building malls, homes, and tall buildings but we can't enjoy our natural resource in a respectful way? Where is the logic in that? I personally feel that if it were only boats on the river, it would be much cleaner. However, I don't want to keep others from enjoying the same river that my family and I enjoy. I just want them to take as much pride in it as we do. I guess I could sum up my thoughts on limiting access to the river with this analogy. It is like getting a new car. Wanting to keep it nice, clean, and as pristine as the day you bought it, you never drive it. What a waste! This is how I feel about changing the access to current river. No one would do this with a new car and I hope you take the same approach to current river. God put current river here for man to enjoy and you should keep it that way.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1097 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 17:49:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I want to thank the National Park Service for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo. Nevertheless the Missouri Sierra Club believes Alternative B could be better. We recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:

Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;  
Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings;  
Bars all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1098 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 18:21:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am from Ellington, and I am 7 years old. I still really want to ride my boat and go swimming. I still want to go to my cabin at the river. Please leave my river alone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1099 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 18:23:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am from Ellington, and I am 4 years old. I really want to go to the river and ride my boat. Please let me go back.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1100 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 18:26:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to talk about the proposed motor limits. The proposed limits would shutdown the part of the river that I have used my entire life.(24 years)My family and I spend a large portion of are time on the river year around in recreational activities, thrash clean up, and relaxing.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1101 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 18:27:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please restore these areas to their natural state. Forbid drinking and drug use on the close to the rivers, on shores and campgrounds. Police the area and decrease pollution of noise, trash and exhaust. Limit cars and motors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1102 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 18:36:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This whole plan shows how the environmental movement has take in control in the management of this areas parks.I think that the regulations limit the use to locals who use it year around more than it limits once a year visitors. I say leave it alone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1103 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 19:10:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I feel Alternative B in the General Management Plan is the most sensible and should be adopted by NPS for the Ozarks National Scenic Riverway. While Alternative A would better restrict motorized boats on the rivers, (which I hope Alternative B will address) B appears to strike more of a middle ground. Motorized boats on the rivers are dangerous to kayakers and canoeists and take away from the beauty and solitude of our Ozark area rivers with their noise and pollution of the rivers. Please adopt Alternative B.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1104 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 19:35:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am voicing my support of option A of General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The local conservators of the park for years have neglected to preserve and enforce the mandates of Public Law 88-492. The park system have back down against political pressure instead of following their mandate. The fact that other local governing bodies will not enforce the laws to protect the river from horse fecal contamination, and building illegal accesses to the road requires the park service to chose the plan that will protect the rivers. It is a pity that the rivers that are under the park services care made the list of 10 most endangered rivers. Because of these facts and history of the park service option A is my choice.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1105 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 19:41:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I favor the more restrictive alternate Plan A. Since there is a significant amount of privately owned land that abuts the river a more restrictive plan may offset or mitigate what may occur on private land to make the overall river/nature experience more like what is proposed in plan B. Looking at all potential impacts or influences along the length of the river and how they may enhance one another or work in opposition will create the best natural environment for all.

Thanks for the opportunity to provide input on this important policy so my grandson may enjoy the natural environment as I did 50 years ago.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1106 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 19:45:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support alternative A. I feel jet boats have no place on our ozark streams. I own property on the Gasconade and our biggest complaint about river users is always jet boaters. If you cant restrict them totally then please consider restricting them above a certain point on each stream. Thank you, Mark Hatfield

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1107 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 20:26:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I do not want any changes in the park.If their has to be changes then the only thing I would want is.That the park would be. Turned over to the state of Missouri.I feel very strongly about this area.I grew up In the area. When I was a child my dad took me boat riding and camping. I have continued to do the same thing as a

adult. With a five month old baby at home I plan to do the same as my dad did if this dream is not wrongly took from me. We have already suffered enough change when are boat motor horsepower was reduced. One story that hits close to home is when this happened my grandpa like many other people was unable to afford a new boat with the proper motor and never went to the river again. He only lived two miles from the river and truley loved this place. So again I ask and beg you please do not change anything.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1108    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 21:18:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My father ( Doug Conway ) who has 30 years of service with the park service is now handicapped . He can not walk long distances any more. He takes my son camping and fishing at log yard gravel bar. If the parks plan of road and gravel bar closures is implemented my father will no longer get to experience these treasured times with his grandson.this saddens and at the same time angers me. I am in favor of the No Action alternative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1109    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 21:31:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I keep reading in news articles and on Facebook that the park is saying that No Action is not really an option anymore. YES IT IS. It was put on the general management plan so therefore it is an option. I am for this option because all the other alternatives A,B and C have closures or restrictions of things that I love to do. Camping at Logyard gravel bar , motor boating and road closures that I use to hunt from.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1110    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 22:13:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Ozark River Keepers  
213 E. 3rd street  
Mountain View, MO 65548  
akruzen@hotmail.com  
tkruzen@gmail.com

Ozark River Keepers Comments on the  
Draft Management Plan of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways  
To us Alternative A offers the most protection for the Ozark Riverways. We prefer that alternative above all of them but you prefer Alternative B, so we are reviewing that alternative and letting you know what we like and dislike about it.

#### Management zones

We are concerned with the lack of primitive zones in Alternative B. -In particular in the Upper Jacks Fork River from the western boundary to Bay Creek. This is a special area and we feel needs the zoning designation of primitive and not natural. Included you will find a list of the different rare and endangered a plants and plants of concern that we have found in the upper section of the Jacks Fork River. We feel that this promotes the area for the primitive designation instead of Natural. Also it is mention that you wish to expand/upgrade the Blue Spring campground. We were surprise to discover that you want to zone that campground area as developed. This area, because of Karst, rare plant species, springs, etc. can only support a moderate level of recreation and the natural resources need to be protected. So it should be zoned "resourced-based recreation" not developed.

#### Motorboats:

We like that some sections of the river are closed to Motor boats. The area in the Upper Jacks Fork between the western boundary and Bay Creek is important because of the water flow in the area. After Fathers Day if you want to float that section, be it by canoe or Kayak, expect to have to get out and walk because the water level is so low. It doesn't need a motorboat to come up the river tearing it apart. It appears that the split motorboat areas (no motor vs. 25 hp) also take into account the water flow in those areas.

We understand that because of the Federal Regulations you should only allow 40 hp motors on the rivers and I like that you are looking into regulations changes that would recognize the jet boat engines.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways speed limit of 60/40hp is fast enough for these rivers. It's not like people are trying to water ski (or at least I hope not)

Horses: Horse trails, Campground, Crossings. Permits:

I was involved with the Horse Trail Study that was done on the Jacks Fork. When we mapped out the horse trails in that area near Eminence, one of the things that surprised everyone in the working group was how many miles of horse trails there are in that area (over 700 miles. They are on private land, MDC, and Park Service)

There were a lot of trails that were not part of the designated trails that people had made in the park. This presents a problem not just for the resources but also for the health of the riders. If someone is hurt it's a lot harder/slower to get to them if they have wandered off the trail and you have to look for them. One of the recommendations that the working group had for the trail system in the area was to post/name the trails, and close the illegal undesignated trails.

There needs to be a Horse Trail Study/Working Group for the Current River as well. There are a lot of horse trails in the Current River that are not designated trails and they need to be either designated or closed.

One of the items that were recommended by the working group was that we try to move parts of the horse trails out of the flood plain area. I am assuming (I hope correctly) that the adding and subtracting of Horse trail miles/crossings is the designation and moving of trails from the flood plain and sensitive areas. If not then this needs to be clarified.

Horse Camps in the Upper Jacks Fork are NOT healthy for the river. We have seen the results from when Boy's Town came down to camp at Ebb and Flo. They brought down about 20 mules and only stayed for the weekend. The campsite vegetation was devastated and not everything came back. The flies were so bad that you didn't want to use that area for weeks. When we had a rain storm the manure flowed right into flat rock and the Jacks Fork River! I can only imagine what it would be like if it was a 24/7 campsite. There should NOT be a 25 horse campground in the area, because of the sensitive plant life and highly developed Karst (Remember the water flow on the upper Jacks Fork is low -especially at Blue spring). Another of our concerns is the introduction of invasive plant species from the hay and manure. Once again the upper section of the Jacks Fork should be in the highest zoning of protection. (See plant list)

I think that the idea of a permitting system for the horses on the river is a great idea. This would give you some control over the numbers using the park. There are more trail ride facilities starting up in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and it's not fair to have a permitting system for canoe rental and not have some system for the horse trail rider facilities. We do not need to have more sections of the park impaired and added to the 303d list due to over use. This is not good for business or the health of the local population.

20 access points

This is confusing and needs better clarification. What access points? Why do you want to remove them? What makes them stay or be relocated? When you design the new access points, what method/design? Designed for the concessioners or the people? Can you separate the picnic/swimming area from the river input area?

Bridge, Roads

If we understand correctly, the reason behind the removal/replacement of the low water bridge at Cedar Grove is because of the low water bridge acting as a dam and this is to be a free flowing river. Is this correct? It would be good to free the flow of the river as long as a correctly built bridge would replace it.

Also which roads are you talking about closing? Are you suggesting that you come into compliance with the roads and trails study that was done in 1990? (It has been almost 24 years.) How many roads are not closed that the study says should be? What is your time line? Do we have to wait another 24 years?

What old access road would you want to reopen to discovery sites? What constitutes a discovery site? Natural, Historical, Cultural? How many are we looking at?

Trails: other than Horse

\*ATV's are allowed in the Park but only on the state roads. They should never be on the gravel bars or trails. The ATV riders would have to comply with the state law for helmets, permits, and flagging.

\*Non motorized Mountain bikes: I think this is a great idea and would expand the recreational use with a low impact on the Riverways. As long as the trail were properly maintained and patrolled by the rangers.

\*Hiking trails- we need more.

\*The main concern that I have with trails through the Park is the lack of funding to patrol the trail and the ATV users continuing the use of the old and new trails. I think that this issue needs to be addressed before any expansion of the trail systems in the Park is done

Gravel Bars:

Motor vehicles do not belong on gravel bars. The only reason that I can see for a variance on that is for Disabled access to gravel bars. At which point they should be used only to drop off the person and then be removed. Too many times we have found oil from leaking vehicles on the gravel bar. This eventually works its way into the river.

Museum collection

I think that it's great to have a facility that could properly store some of Museum collections of the Park Service. What I would love to see is also a way to display parts of the Museum collection so that the history of the area can be shared with the people. It would be great to have a display area that can be shared with visitors.

#### Cultural History

We feel that the Park has not promoted the cultural History of the area as much as it could. The people of the area have a lot of amazing talent and knowledge. You need some sort of way for the knowledge to be highlighted and shown. (Maybe a cultural village/town could be created?) We need to make sure that the cultural history of the area is not lost!!

#### Powder Mill

We are concerned about the development of Powder Mill. When we went to check out the area I noticed that the campground was in the flood plain. I feel that this would limit the amount of development that can be done. How much area is out of the flood plain? Will you go ahead and develop part the flood plain?

#### Volunteer groups

The Park Service needs better feed back to the people who volunteer for the Park. Maybe a dedicated staff contact person could be possible? When people are willing to do volunteer work for the Park there needs to be a person that to contact directly. That person needs to be able to explain why it might be taking longer, why something can or can't be done, etc. Basically keep in touch and if need be help walk them through the process.

#### Problems in the gaps

Some of the problems in the gaps and outside the Park boundary need to be worked on. It would be great if the Park Service and the DNR could expand the networking that they have been doing. Remembering that outside of the boundaries is the jurisdiction of the DNR. For instance, there are developments with poorly planned roads and even some illegal dumps next to the river.

#### Educational facilities.

We had hopes that the Park Service and the Stream Team Program could partner and turn the old fishing lodge (Welsh Lodge) into an educational school/camp for the children of Missouri. A facility along the pristine Current River would be of great benefit to people who have never seen what a healthy river is. When I went to school we were lucky enough to have a camp that we could go to for a week. It was a way to teach us about the outdoors. It taught me respect for the environment and taught me to open my mind and heart to the world around me. The kids are our future and we must find a way to expand their world beyond the TV and video games. .

#### Hellbender, Bats, caves, etc.

We must do everything to protect the Hellbenders and bats within the Park. There are some caves that have not been gated and are in need of gating. Unknown circumstances are killing off hellbenders. Understanding the concern over identifying hellbender habitat, there needs to be a definite designation of protection for such habitat. We have found hellbenders in the Upper Jacks Fork. Horse camps and more development would put them at increased risk. Bats are major pollinators and eat millions of pounds of insects and, rare or not, are being decimated by the white nose fungus.. The ONSR needs to fully protect their bats. Meeting a hellbender or photographing a rare plant are some of the reasons people come here! Bats help make the experience more pleasant without unreasonable amounts of insect bites.

Rare and Endangered Native Plants as well as Plants of Concern Up and Downstream of Jam-up Cave (Between Western boundary and Bay Creek) on the Jacks Fork River-These are plants I have physically verified.

1. *Campanula rotundifolia* Bluebells of Scotland
2. *Galium boreale* Northern bedstraw
3. *Plantago cordata*...Heartleaf plantain
4. *Cheilanthes lanosa* Hairy lip fern
5. *Goodyera pubescens* Rattlesnake plantain
6. *Cypripedium calceolus* tall yellow ladyslipper
7. *Cypripedium parviflorum* small flowered ladyslipper
8. *Silene regia* Royal catchfly
9. *Aster furcatus* forked aster
10. *Delphinium exaltatum* tall larkspur
11. *Sedum ternatum* Stonecrop
12. *Zigadenus elegans* Mountain deathcamas
13. *Gratiola viscidula* Hedge hyssop
14. *Helenium virginianum* Virginia sneezeweed

15. *Viola pallens* Small white violet
16. *Phlox bifida* Sandphlox
17. *Amsonia ciliata* Ciliate bluestar
18. *Ribes odoratum* Golden current
19. *Berberis Canadensis* American barberry
20. *Matalea oblique* climbing milkweed
21. *Waldsteinia fragarioides* Barren strawberry
22. *Hamamelis virginiana* Eastern witch hazel
23. *Liparis loeselii* Loessel's twayblade
24. *Trillium pusillum* Ozark trillium
25. *Tradescantia longipes* Ozark spiderwort
26. *Trautvetteria caroliniensis* Carolina bugbane
27. *Sullivantia sullivantii* Sullivant's coolwort
28. *Athyrium pycnocarpon* Glade fern
29. *Spiranthes odorata* Ladies tresses

#### ONSR Reverting to State Control

Although it is not mentioned in the Management Plan, we must comment on the numerous local people being stirred up by Lieutenant Governor Peter Kinder, Rep Jason Smith and the State representatives and senators who attended the various Park Plan Comment Meetings. In this politically polarized era where many people operate outside the realm of facts, we need to entertain the impossible.

We cannot recall any established national parks ever relinquished to state or private control. In our view, such a move would be a disaster for the resource. The Missouri legislature has historically denied adequate funding to Missouri State Parks. The legislature would most likely have difficulty finding money for the purchase of such a large parcel of land and certainly would be unable or unwilling to supply adequate operational funding. It would then be too tempting to sell off pieces of or the entire ONSR in its entirety. Such a scenario would leave the rivers, springs and adjacent land open for abuse from ORV/ATVs, pollution, erosion, overuse and antithetical industry such as mining. A half century of federal management has preserved these magnificent rivers and springs for ALL Americans to enjoy. The ONSR brings in millions of dollars of revenue and employment to local counties. Decommissioning this National Park would be a physical and fiscal disaster.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1111    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 22:39:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I don't see a problem with the current regulations as far as the boats are concerned. I know the floaters are plentiful during the summer months but the fishermen and gigers use the rivers all year round. The local people of Van Buren clean the river after the visitors have long gone home. Why punish the locals! They live close to this beautiful river for a reason. I say leave well enough alone. It has worked for the last twenty years, give it another twenty. Thank You.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1112    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,25,2014 05:24:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family and I have been traveling to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways since the mid 70's and have seen the results of an all out assault on the area.

We have been disappointed by the reduction in the wildness of the area and the proliferation of access points to the river by recreational vehicles and horses.

Please adopt Alternative A of the proposed management plan as it will provide for closing of these illegal roads, and undesignated horse trails and bar all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

We visit the Current and Jacks Fork rivers to experience our country's wild areas which we have so few of any more. Please restore the wildness to these regions by adopting Alternative A.

Sincerely,

Eric Hoyer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1113    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,25,2014 07:03:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No change needed thanks anyway!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1114    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,25,2014 09:52:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I really think the Senic River Ways should be turned over to the State of Missouri. They have proven they can take better care of their parks. I think it is just sad that at the recent Gov. shutdown you would not let your employees mow the grass and take care of the parks but they could ride around in the vehicles and burn gas. what is the sad part is it was just to make a point. The truth of the matter is the Local people take better care of the parks than anybody by picking up trash and helping floaters in distress. We are the ones that are hurt worse by your changes. I have camped on the banks of the Current River for 45 years. I hate to see that change. I do feel that everyone should be able to share the parks. Its just the local people are a asset to the park service. So I hope you really consider us in making your decision. Thank You.

Ronald W. Reynolds

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1115    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,25,2014 10:38:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alternative B with the following stipulation: Mountain biking should be allowed on all multi-purpose trails where hiking and horseback riding are allowed. Currently acceptable exceptions would be designated Wilderness or Primitive areas and short hiking only Nature trails near Visitor Centers. Under no other circumstances should mountain biking be forbidden on any trails acceptable for horseback riding unless a mountain biking/hiking only alternative is built along the same general path.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1116    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,25,2014 12:52:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in support of the No-Action Alternative, I am an avid horseback rider using lots of Missouri trails and I hope to continue to use these trails the way I always have.

Thanks  
Chris Elbe

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1117    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,25,2014 12:59:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am proposing the "No Change Alternative". The other alternatives sound as if they would restrict usage to one or more targeted groups.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1118    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,25,2014 13:03:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please choose the no-action alternative. You have already eliminated the only equestrian camping that is not at a commercial site (ironically called "Horse Camp", northeast of Alley Spring. Now you want to take away even more. As a tax payer, I say NO. Stop taking things away from equestrians. You can claim you will build more designated trails, but due to budget concerns, I doubt that funding would ever appear.

I support the NO CHANGE ALTERNATIVE!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1119    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,25,2014 13:18:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We have enjoyed many hours along the Current River. Our usual mode is equine related. Always cognizant of the fact of combined USE we are careful to leave as small an impact on the area as possible. The most troublesome impact we have witnessed is the human waste left in the areas of canoe landings. I refer not only to trash but also excrement. Having looked at the information available to us (we have slow internet service so the document will not download) I see no provision to reduce the impact of human waste. Folks will still need to eliminate, where are they to do this and not contaminate? Please remember we all should have USE of our National Parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1120    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,25,2014 13:18:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please to not eliminate horse use of the trails. We want to share the beauty of this land the same as hikers. The Ozark's have such wonderful natural elements, which need to be experienced by all citizens..

Please keep the trails open to equestrians....

Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1121    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,25,2014 13:28:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a trail rider and use a number of trails in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and would like the ability to keep using these trail. We as trail riders take care of our trail systems and enjoy being able to cross water ways and enjoy any and everything about them when we are out riding. We do not have that many places to ride now that are as beautiful as this part of the country so please keep our trails and rivers open and usable for us equestrian riders and other multi use trail user. Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1122    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,25,2014 13:33:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like the no change alternative. This land is public land, why in the world would you close it to people who like to ride horses? By shortening the amount of trails for horses you will be wearing the trails out in a faster way than spreading out and having a lesser impact. By reducing the amount of trails you are also risking injury to people and animals that would be forced to be in a closer area to each other. Not all horses get along with each other.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1123    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,25,2014 13:36:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please don't close horse trails. I feel they are important to the economy of any area. If the trails close and people have no legal place to ride, then is when you will get problems with people riding illegally and damaging the wilderness for real.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1124    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,25,2014 13:37:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Why are the trails being closed? We need to save our trails from closing and from misuse. Hikers and equestrians need these trails in order to view the natural beauty of Missouri. If you close the trails not only will you lose the good will of these groups, who happen to spend a lot of money on their "hobbies", but you will also lose revenue from these people using the businesses in the surrounding areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1125    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208



**Received:** Jan,25,2014 13:52:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** no change alternative!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1126 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,25,2014 14:04:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Missouri rivers are our most outstanding natural asset. They belong to all residents of the state, and in fact, the nation. As you devise policies, please bear in mind the famous quote from the Constitution of the Iroquois Nation:

"In all of your deliberations in the Confederate Council, in your efforts at law making, in all your official acts, self-interest shall be cast into oblivion. Cast not over your shoulder behind you the warnings of the nephews and nieces should they chide you for any error or wrong you may do, but return to the way of the Great Law which is just and right. Look and listen for the welfare of the whole people and have always in view not only the present but also the coming generations, even those whose faces are yet beneath the surface of the ground - the unborn of the future Nation." In conclusion, Oren Lyons, Chief of the Onondaga Nation, wrote: "We are looking ahead, as is one of the first mandates given us as chiefs, to make sure and to make every decision that we make relate to the welfare and well-being of the seventh generation to come. . . .What about the seventh generation? Where are you taking them? What will they have?"

Not only should Missouri rivers be preserved for future human generations, but particular care must be taken to protect the silent, voteless, but most deeply invested interests.....that is, the birds, fish and wildlife that depend on these rivers for survival. What policies will do best to sustain other species, as well as the beauty and water quality of our scenic rivers in the long run? Certainly not the demands of selfish and destructive wreck-reationists:

[http://www.stltoday.com/news/local/metro/doubts-about-the-future-of-a-national-park-in-the/article\\_02722479-7801-5d45-83f1-10d2a3ea21e1.html#.UuQUxdrezM.email](http://www.stltoday.com/news/local/metro/doubts-about-the-future-of-a-national-park-in-the/article_02722479-7801-5d45-83f1-10d2a3ea21e1.html#.UuQUxdrezM.email)

I had thought of supporting Plan B, but having read this article, I now support Plan A, the most restrictive of policies. I feel certain that only the most stringent protections can hope to preserve the unique beauty and ecological quality of Missouri's scenic rivers, for the sake of both nature and future generations.

thank you for this input opportunity,

Gwyn Wahlmann  
Kirkwood, Mo

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1127 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,25,2014 14:31:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear committee,

It always amazes me when I "hear" about changes to my living area that some government organization is taking on in order to "protect or to make things better". I wonder for whom those changes and new rules and regulations are actually for? Is it job security for some of those whose job really wasn't ever necessary anyway who like the big-government power trips and the "power" to tell the small-town country hillbillies just how to live? When,Where and How to function. examples:"primitive or wilderness, limited access, ONSR, horsepower limits, parking/camping permits, campground closures". Are you getting my point? And yes, I feel some control is necessary but, where is the stopping point? Thanks to gov. "rights" I have to pay for a gate that use to cost me \$25.00 or less, to drive across 400 feet of U. S. forest property to get to my property but, now it costs me almost \$100. What can be done about that? The bill comes to me yearly from somewhere in California. Thank you. I have to get across government property to my property. Wait, who is "government/ U. S forest service"? Oh yeah, it's me too. The property hasn't changed, there is no use/abuse issue here, that's just how it is. So PLEASE, give us locals more rules, regulations and government control because we REALLY DO need it. I know you can't please everybody all the time, but WHEN is common sense going to come into play here? I love all the "naturalist" groups and "caring and concerned"

groups for the preservation of natural areas around our country, have any of them ever been on Current River? Living here, I have seen first hand that tubers, floaters and jet boats are just a big catastrophe waiting to happen. Maybe, someone of power should look at that. Maybe if something as minute as safety was a priority, local citizens could get behind that. It seems that recent years of droughts and decreasing water levels that concerns about less depth for running areas for boats might carry some reason for some changes? Please give this some thought, all of this, before it's too late. Lots of concerns, so is the answer to ruin the use for everyone who actually lives in the involved area? PLEASE THINK.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1128    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,25,2014 14:39:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been coming down to the Ozark Riverways for more then 30 years and enjoying the trails and beauty of the area. I know many people from all over the United States that also come and enjoy the trails and rivers. I believe that you should leave the trails and riverways the way they are. Mother Nature does more harm to the trails and rivers ways then Trail riders ever could. Do you want to get rid of her also. Or the State could put seveal bridges over the rivers for the people and horses to travel across. Please do not mess with the riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1129    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,25,2014 14:42:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** save the trails for hikers and horse riders !!!!! Leave the trails alone !!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1130    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,25,2014 14:49:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We so enjoy riding our horses in this beautiful area. We pack out what we bring in and want this area to stay open for us to enjoy for many years to come. Please don't take this away from nature loving equestrians who are doing no harm!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1131    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,25,2014 15:17:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My first visits to what is now the Ozark National Scenic Riverways were as a child in the 1940s. As a teen in the 1950s I floated the Current and Jacks Fork numerous times in my canoe. I've returned repeatedly over the years to do floating and enjoy this wonderful national treasure, most recently last year.

I was fully supportive of the National Riverways designation at its inception. But I'm dismayed by the steady erosion of the "natural" in this wonderful resource.

Too much commercialism, too much unbridled and unauthorized use.

These riverways don't belong to the residents of the counties they traverse. They belong to all of us.

As resources that have already been degraded, they deserve stronger protection so that they survive for future generations, including the folks who live closer to them than I do, and to my grandchildren when they reach the age to enjoy them.

I support Plan A.

Robert Klepper

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1132    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,25,2014 15:41:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Plan B is better.

The more natural the better. Less motorized better. Trails for foot only. Protect the wildlife, native plants and clean water.

You all have much to read so I will leave at that.

REF

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1133 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,25,2014 15:51:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please don't close horse trails. Horses are a part of America, and what better way to enjoy the outdoors than on the back of a horse? We're slowly getting pushed out of areas to ride, making our world smaller and smaller. Please reconsider this, thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1134 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,25,2014 16:07:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** First let me start off by saying that I LOVE our Jacks Fork and Current Rivers. I have grown up here and will continue to live here probably till I die. I therefore have a natural concern for the health of our riverways and surrounding land.

I am sure my local friends who have also commented share my concerns for the health of the riverways. But some of these friends of mine I am afraid may have commented with heated irrationality, which I am also afraid may make them look like the silly, uneducated, backwoods, radical stereotype that plagues this area of the Ozarks ("hillbillies" as we are commonly referred to), and therefore NPS and ONSR may not take their comments seriously. But to enlighten NPS, there are plenty of very smart, very educated people who came from this area. Raised from Eminence alone we have teachers, nurses, doctors, lawyers, congressmen, and even an astronaut. Therefore I am going to attempt to keep my comments sounding of an educated mind who has plenty of common sense and reason, as I do have a Bachelor's Degree in Elementary Education myself.

There are good reasons that the local people are so emotional and, at times, irrational about the ONSR changing things, which I can try to explain. First, people here are very sentimental about our ancestry. Because of this we are all still upset that the NPS acquired this land and rivers to begin with and created ONSR in 1964, because we all feel our ancestors were strong-armed into handing their land over, never to be inhabited or used again. To us that is sad. People feel that the NPS's original plan was either a lie or just has changed with change of leadership. Either way people here are hurt that NPS is in charge and does not trust the locals to take care of the rivers, and scared that they will end up losing what little rights they have left.

Next, people here feel they have a right (understandably) to visit these old homesteads of their ancestors. These homesteads dotted the land and riverbanks of the ONSR. This is why there are so many "illegal" roads, because people do what they can to get to them, including making said roads. Also, being able to use the river in the present ways is important to our heritage. If we cannot use it and enjoy it and savor our use of it then our heritage is gone.

Additionally, since the NPS has "taken over", people here feel constantly threatened by NPS because they already cannot do what they want to do with the river, and are afraid that the rest of their rights with the river will be taken away. Because people from this area have so many high stakes (financial, emotional, recreational, ancestral, traditional) in these rivers those of you from NPS and ONSR should not be surprised of the emotional and angry response from the local people.

I, of all people, do not wish to see our riverways ruined. My friends and I also want to preserve them so that we (and everyone else who visits the area) can enjoy them. Therefore we share with the NPS and ONSR their wishes to maintain the riverways. I understand the need for laws and regulations in order to maintain them. That being said, the ONSR is such a big park that affects all of the local people who have grown up in the area, whose ancestors grew up in the area, and considering that the area has few assets other than the river and land surrounding it, few other industries than the river that are able to sustain the economy of the area. This struggling economy also affects the ONSR. Reason being if our towns die out because of the tourist industry crashing because no one is allowed to use the river, then ONSR will also die out, as it is the tourist industry that sustains it.

So the question is what do I suggest ONSR does? An outline of my thoughts follows.

A. **PLAN SCOPE:** The purpose of the GMP is to provide guidance on future management decisions and regulatory action. However, the present draft contains over 500 pages of detailed use prescriptions. Such detail will prohibit discretionary decisions in the future, and not allow for meaningful consideration of changing conditions. The GMP should be rewritten to include mere policy, not specifics on how to carry out those policies.

B. **ZONING:** The concept of zoning will segregate differing recreational uses. This will cause users to lose the ability to continue with present recreational uses in familiar and emotionally meaningful park areas. For me alone, these special areas include but are not limited to (on Jack's Fork River) Alley Spring, Hole in the Wall, and Shawnee Creek, and (on Current River) the whole area from Twin Rocks to Two Rivers to Blue Spring, and then Big Spring.

C. **PRIMARY OBJECTIVE AND FAVORED USE:** The primary objective of the GMP is to convert the vast majority of the park to a natural area where evidence of human use is minimal. Similarly, the NPS valued user experience is the ability to observe native wildlife, explore a cave, or ponder the size of a spring flow in solitude. [see GMP page 26]. It is this policy objective and valued user experience that will have the most negative impact on promoting a wide variety of recreational use. While the concept of a natural area may be desired by some, others favor recreation based improvements and amenities. Additionally, while pondering the size of a spring flow in solitude is an important user experience, equally important are those social experiences realized between friends and family. No one use should predominate to the exclusion of another use, and policy formulated to accomplish the same is unnecessary. Present conditions provide both experiences. As social recreational use predominately occurs on summer weekends, the avid spring ponderers will find solitude during the week, winter, spring and fall. There is no reason why the NPS cannot offer amenities which do not detract from natural aesthetics.

D. **GENERAL LAND USE:** The GMP limits land uses to specific activities depending on the zones. Primitive and natural zones are the most restrictive to recreational use, and compromise 88% of the NPS preferred Alternative B. Resource-based recreation zones are the most conducive to promoting recreational use. In my opinion, NPS needs to reduce primitive and natural zones and increase resource-based recreation zones. Increased recreational zoning is necessary to promote the park purpose of use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources.

E. **GENERAL RIVER USE:** The GMP provides three river use zones. Non-motorized watercraft uses are authorized under all zone concepts. Motorized watercraft use is prohibited in non-motorized zones. Seasonal mixed provides for seasonal motorized watercraft use. And, mixed use zones provide for both motorized and non-motorized watercraft. The NPS preferred Alternative B calls for 48 seasonal mixed use and non-motorized zones. In my opinion, NPS needs to increase mixed use zones, and I am against seasonal or permanent closures. Seasonal mixed use or non-motorized zones displace motorized watercraft users from those familiar and emotionally meaningful park areas. Non-motorized user experiences remain readily available through the week and summer, when low river levels render large segments unnavigable for motorized traffic.

F. **SPECIFIC LAND USE:** The GMP proposes significant specific limitations on recreational land use. These limitations include approximately 65 miles of road closures, prohibiting motorized vehicles and campers on gravel bars, closing approximately 20 access points, establishing a permit system for horse back riders, eliminating vehicular traffic in primitive areas, and establishing visitor standards designed to limit the number of participants for different use activities. In my opinion, NPS should increase land zones that increase recreational uses, such as demanding large increases in resource-based recreation zones. My family (husband and I and three young daughters) largely uses the river with a motorboat and sometimes we take our daughters swimming at a gravel bar such as Alley Spring. It is important for us to be able to use these areas because we cannot afford a swimming pool or to drive to a lake to use our boat and swim. Furthermore we have no emotional attachment to any lakes around the area, plus they all feel dirty to us, so we don't want to go there. Therefore we should be able to continue using the river the way we do now. Finally, visitor Use Indicators and Standards will prohibit management from considering changing conditions of recreational use in the future. Specifically, management cannot be tied to arbitrary number limits that do not take into consideration advancements in recreational technology and resource conditions.

G. **SPECIFIC RIVER USE:** Similar to land uses, the GMP proposes significant specific limitations on river use.

Alternative A would eliminate 60/40 horsepower motorized watercraft. Alternatives A-C impose horsepower restrictions downstream from Big Springs. Further, visitor standards place numeric limitations for watercraft. If those limitations are exceeded, management is directed to take corrective action which includes potential closures. Additionally, Visitor Use Indicators and Standards are too strict because they will prohibit management from considering changing conditions of recreational use in the future. Management can not be tied to arbitrary number limits that do not take into consideration advancements in recreational technology and resource conditions. I think NPS should increase river based recreational use. As to horsepower limitations, larger horsepower motors are important, not just wanted, because the river is not safe to navigate with a low horsepower motor, especially if the boat is filled to capacity. This also affects emergency response. I understand and agree that current boat horsepower limits are abused. The answer to that is to make all "souped-up" motors illegal, and make it a law that motors have their horsepower posted by the manufacturer in big letters on the head of the motor. That way it makes it a lot more difficult for people to abuse the current law.

H. ROWDINESS: If ONSR is concerned about rowdiness on the river, then ban alcohol usage. Simple as that. In my vast experience with dealing with rowdy people, they are all drinking. Take the booze away, then they will most likely not be rowdy. Some would say limit alcohol usage. But that will not work because that is too difficult to enforce. NPS needs to take it all away. No one needs alcohol to have a good time. And if they want to drink they can do it somewhere else.

I. PATROL: The laws we have are not enforced. Our rivers need to have Park Rangers on them, at the boat ramps and gravel bars and in boats on the river, patrolling the area for illegal and rowdy behavior.

J. MAINTENANCE: When Alley Spring and Big Spring were state parks they were well taken care of. The camping areas were maintained and fixed when damaged, the brush was kept cut, and a person could see the Alley Spring branch while walking along it. It was like a park. It was beautiful! Slowly and unfortunately, over the years, perhaps with heads of maintenance changes or superintendent changes, these areas have been allowed to deteriorate and grow up with brush to the point that a person cannot even tell Alley is there from the highway. There have been camping spots closed and even a "loop" eliminated simply because maintenance doesn't want to fix them when the river cuts into them. This, in my opinion, is laziness, a travesty and very embarrassing to me for our tourists to see. And quite frankly it is ugly. Alley Spring is ugly. How sad. I beg of ONSR to go back to taking care of these areas. There are other NPS parks in our country that are still well taken care of. There is no reason that ours shouldn't be.

My bottom line is this. ONSR's stated purpose is to provide recreational use. The draft GMP erodes this purpose. If ONSR's purpose is not really to provide recreational use but only to preserve and protect the riverways by banning more and more recreational use, then ONSR needs to change it's stated purpose. And the way the locals feel about NPS now makes them wish they and their ancestors would have chosen to put a lake in all those years ago when the Corps of Engineers tried to. At least NPS wouldn't be here to ruin our heritage.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1135	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,25,2014 16:17:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** I support plan A. The need to restrict vehicular and equestrian access is imperative to saving our scenic Riverways. It is unfortunate that many citizens in Missouri insist on destroying nature by eroding the banks, attempting to swamp canoes with large wakes, throwing trash in the river, playing loud music and numerous other transgressions. Educating people to respect the river is important as well as how to maneuver a canoe safely through the waters.

The actions of the jet boat community at the Scenic Riverways open houses demonstrates a need for the NPS to limit their access and size of their motors on the Current and Jack's Fork rivers. They arrived early at the Powder Valley open house with boat trailers and proceeded to park them at a diagonal, some of them taking up 6 parking spots. They then proceeded to shout over comments people were trying to make. When one attendee asked them to explain their sign "Sierra Club drowns people", five jet boaters verbally attacked him. They never explained their sign.

The additional law enforcement will definitely be needed until the children of the current jet boaters can be educated on river preservation!

I support the designation of the Big Springs Wilderness area.

Thank you for taking the time to preserve two of Missouri's most precious rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1136 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,25,2014 16:20:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,  
I married at the age of 17. My husband and I have 3 children. We spent our weekends camping at Current River and in tents. We cooked on an open fire and spent time motor boating ,fishing and swimming. Our kids grew to love the Current and Jacks Fork river and spending time outdoors. They now have families of their own and we own a cabin on Current river. We all own motor boats, Kayaks and tubes. We also enjoy canoeing. Our family enjoys swimming, boating, fishing and just being together while on the river.

Please do not take this privilege away from us.

Thank You, Nina Roberts

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1137 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,25,2014 17:26:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The final management plan, in my opinion, should lean towards Plan A to preserve and protect the park for present and future generations. I recognize the historically tenuous relationship the ONSR has with the local residents, and I understand many of their concerns. But ultimately, the park belongs to all citizens, not merely those of a few Missouri counties. I have witnessed patrons using the ONSR in ways that would be unfathomable in places like Yosemite or Yellowstone. While I respect the familial and cultural traditions of the area, there needs to be more care, more restraint taken in the use of the park. Traditions tending towards poor stewardship are not ones that should continue. Please make a decision for all. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1138 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,25,2014 17:52:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have canoed the Current and Jacks Fork river system many times over the past 40 years. Usually I spend 2 or 3 days on the river canoeing and camping on gravel bars. It offers a unique recreational experience that without fail always renews me. I strongly believe that the river should be managed with non-motorized watercraft as the overwhelmingly predominate focus. That does not mean that I think motorboats, horseback riding, hunting and other uses should be totally excluded. I can't canoe on any of the numerous equestrian trails in the state. Nor can I canoe at any of the public or private ATV/motorcycle parks. Between Truman and Lake of the Ozarks there are 115 thousand acres of water that are open to fishing, this doesn't count the other numerous lakes in the state. There are many places for people to pursue these other recreational activities, but there are very few places to float a clear stream through a relatively undeveloped landscape.

As far as local residents are concerned some things are just too special to keep to ourselves. They must be shared.

I prefer Plan A, but am willing to compromise and support Plan B.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1139 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,25,2014 21:14:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose you changing the trails on the Scenic Riverways. I am 70 years old and enjoy being able to ride and see such beautiful country. There are so few trails and places to ride. I live in Rolla where I have no where to ride that isn't privately owned or black top roads. By closing trails it will make the one's open a lot more congested.

We are losing more and more of our rights everyday Please don't let us lose such enjoyment by closing these trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1140 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,25,2014 21:19:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Wildlife are what make a park a park. Without the wildlife, you would have something like a quarry. Sound like fun? Consequently, the wildlife much get top priority, because they can't protect themselves from us. In particular, mountain biking and other off-road vehicles should be prohibited. Please select the alternative that most protects the wildlife.

Bicycles should not be allowed in any natural area. They are inanimate objects and have no rights. There is also no right to mountain bike. That was settled in federal court in 1996: <http://mjvande.nfshost.com/mtb10.htm> . It's dishonest of mountain bikers to say that they don't have access to trails closed to bikes. They have EXACTLY the same access as everyone else - - ON FOOT! Why isn't that good enough for mountain bikers? They are all capable of walking....

A favorite myth of mountain bikers is that mountain biking is no more harmful to wildlife, people, and the environment than hiking, and that science supports that view. Of course, it's not true. To settle the matter once and for all, I read all of the research they cited, and wrote a review of the research on mountain biking impacts (see <http://mjvande.nfshost.com/scb7.htm> ). I found that of the seven studies they cited, (1) all were written by mountain bikers, and (2) in every case, the authors misinterpreted their own data, in order to come to the conclusion that they favored. They also studiously avoided mentioning another scientific study (Wisdom et al) which did not favor mountain biking, and came to the opposite conclusions.

Those were all experimental studies. Two other studies (by White et al and by Jeff Marion) used a survey design, which is inherently incapable of answering that question (comparing hiking with mountain biking). I only mention them because mountain bikers often cite them, but scientifically, they are worthless.

Mountain biking accelerates erosion, creates V-shaped ruts, kills small animals and plants on and next to the trail, drives wildlife and other trail users out of the area, and, worst of all, teaches kids that the rough treatment of nature is okay (it's NOT!). What's good about THAT?

To see exactly what harm mountain biking does to the land, watch this 5-minute video: <http://vimeo.com/48784297>.

In addition to all of this, it is extremely dangerous: [http://mjvande.nfshost.com/mtb\\_dangerous.htm](http://mjvande.nfshost.com/mtb_dangerous.htm) .

For more information: <http://mjvande.nfshost.com/mtbfaq.htm> .

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1141 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,25,2014 22:52:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I request the no change alternative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1142 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,25,2014 22:55:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** No change alternative requested.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1143 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 05:37:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** National Parks need protection from exploitation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1144 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 06:31:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I prefer implementation of alternate plan A

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1145 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 06:35:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I prefer the implementation of alternative plan A

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1146 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 06:48:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The rivers and streams are enjoyed by everyone lucky enough to live near or visit them through out the year. They are the property of the people, they are for our use and enjoyment. Just stay out of our wilderness and leave us alone.

No Change.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1147 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 07:08:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan/Wilderness Study/EIS

I am in favor of a total ban of ALL ATV, motorcycles, motorbikes, motorized vehicles in and around National Park trails, heavy fines and jail time for crossing or fording rivers, streams, inlets, creeks, swamps and springs. No ATVs allowed in camping areas or park lands at all. ATV usage on private property should be restricted to within 500 yards of any National Park, Monument or other public land designation.

Horseback riding restricted to only designated back country trails that are at least 100 yards from any waterway and may not cross or interact with any type of water course no matter how small or large. Horseback riders must have a special license and pay a fee for use of trails to offset damage and fecal waste left behind. Horseback riding should not come within 100 yards of any camping or other recreational use area designated for pedestrian use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1148 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 08:26:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am very much against this new proposal. For people that don't live near these river ways it might be hard to understand just how much they mean to the people that grew up on them. They are a way of life for many of us. I ask you to not restrict our heritage any more than you already have done, when you took these lands from us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1149 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 08:28:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I think it's a shame that we live here on these rivers and are the ones that clean up these rivers after you people that REALLY don't give a shit mess them up all summer. Be truthful here to yourselves for a minute, How many of you have went to the bathroom in the river, or took a bath or washed your hair in it? All you "educated idiots" want to do is something, anything for attention. My kids and grand kids fish, camp , and boat ride on the river. My husband and I ride horses and mules and camp. Camping down on the river banks, gravel bars helps keep it cooler than being out in a wide open field somewhere. All the government wants from the people of this so called great land of ours is to take it all away from us and leave u with nothing. Do you want the short off our backs too? I have a great solution for your problem, you city people stay in the city and leave us country people the hell alone. We are better off without you cause when your here it's always trouble.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1150 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208 **Private:** Y

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support alternative A. The National Park Service must preserve our national treasures for



current and future use for all citizens!

I have visited most of our National Parks and have always been impressed with the competence that the NPS exhibits in maintaining our natural wonders. As an avid canoeist over the years, I have followed the degradation of our National Scenic Riverways in Missouri from overuse and what appears to be an improper use plan.

As with most of our national resources, now is the time to regulate them properly for the future.

Please withhold my personal, identifying information.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1151    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 08:38:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Good morning,

Please leave this area alone. People living near to this area have a greater entitlement to use it as it is their tax dollars support the surrounding infrastructure. Any thing that would limit tourism or use of this area is NOT wanted. This is one of the few sources of income for the locals.

Local that is, state control, would be more desirable for these parks, as they have a vested interest as residents in the same state.

Thanks,  
Craig Vignery

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1152    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 08:56:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Ozark national scenic riverway has been a source of enjoyment to thousands of people yearly. If more restrictions are added it will change how the river is enjoyed. It should be left the way it is. There are enough regulations. The people that would suffer from the additional restrictions are not the ones that are harming it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1153    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 09:19:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would hope that option B be chosen at a minimum and possibly some items in option A be included.

The residents in the area seem to have an attitude that the federal government and anyone that doesn't live in the area needs to stay out of their business and let them run things. Even some of our politicians make these statements. I would remind these people to consider how much money the St. Louis region generates for statewide use. I believe this does give us a right to have input in these decisions.

How many folks in the area are on social security, medicare, medicaid, disability? Enough that you clearly don't want the federal government to stay out of your business in all areas.

I choose option B with some items of option A to be included.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1154    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 09:43:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I feel the government should back off the rights of the American People, I feel the government is getting to big for its own good and not the good of the People, They no longer care about what is good for the People but what is good for their own Pockets! We don't need more rules, more laws, we need less rules, and less laws. At some point Like Nov 2014 and 2016 We the People will make change, Taking away more rights of the Peoples Land would just stop more families from doing more out doors activities like camping, swimming, boating,

fishing, hiking, What we need is to bring back family values, Values that teach people who love the outdoors to enjoy what we have around us, and now The government wants to add rules and laws, close roads, How is this going to help our Country, I really wish People would use the Brains God gave them!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1155    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 09:56:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The federal regulators for the park system are too far removed from the needs of local peoples. Preservation groups have good intentions as do the park regulators, unfortunately neither understand the balance of the earth. First you raped and pillaged now you wish to isolate the area from humans. You are wrong. This area has a long cultural history that we do not wish to lose. I feel very strongly that federal control needs to be handed over to the state to be regulated by people who understand and appreciate our culture and history. More intervention and regulations are not appreciated or wanted.

Community leader and treasurer for the Western Cherokee

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1156    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 10:00:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Im from the Cardareva section of the river. I truly don't see the problems in this are of the river that I kerp hearing about. There are three weekends a yesr when the gravel bar is full and those are holidays other weekends travel is much much lighter. People keep talking about atvs well they are already not aloud on the gravel bar. And the river is to deep in our area for any crossings. Then there is the horse poop thing people keep bringing up. Well that is not in our area either! But in truth if it was so bad upstream that it was polluting the waters so badly my children should have been sick long ago from the many gallons that they consume in a year. I've heard many people say that the locals trash up the river. Well that is not true either. We clean it everytime we are there. We never leave trash and we pick ip others trash if we see it. We have a trash pick ip party every year also. So in closing I just want to say maybe if you made people follow the rules that are already there there would not be so many problems. I'm for the no action alternative. I don't belive the government should be able to take away what God himself has given us to enjoy. Think long and hard about enforcing the rules that you have and you might not tick nearly as many people off as taking it away from those of us who have done nothing but love it and take care of it all of our lives.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1157    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 10:22:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly support Alternative B. I have loved camping and canoeing on the Jacks Fork and Current River since I was a boy. We took our 3 girls once or twice every summer and absolutely loved the beauty of the rivers and forests. When we moved back to St Louis after about 10 years out of state, we were shocked at how over crowded it has become and how much litter was not being picked up. But to have ATVs running up, down and through the waterways was the last straw. This once glorious, peaceful respite has become a Six Flags water park populated by drunks and hillbillies.

Please stand up to the pressure of the locals who seem to see this National Scenic Waterway as their personal bar and ATV playground. This land is our land and it needs to be protected for future generations.

Thanks.

Steve Nollau

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1158    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 10:33:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Im from the Cardareva section of the river. I truly don't see the problems in this are of the river that I kerp hearing about. There are three weekends a yesr when the gravel bar is full and those are holidays other weekends travel is much much lighter. People keep talking about atvs well they are already not aloud on the gravel

bar. And the river is too deep in our area for any crossings. Then there is the horse poop thing people keep bringing up. Well that is not in our area either! But in truth if it was so bad upstream that it was polluting the waters so badly my children should have been sick long ago from the many gallons that they consume in a year. I've heard many people say that the locals trash up the river. Well that is not true either. We clean it everytime we are there. We never leave trash and we pick up others trash if we see it. We have a trash pick up party every year also. So in closing I just want to say maybe if you made people follow the rules that are already there there would not be so many problems. I'm for the no action alternative. I don't believe the government should be able to take away what God himself has given us to enjoy. Think long and hard about enforcing the rules that you have and you might not tick nearly as many people off as taking it away from those of us who have done nothing but love it and take care of it all of our lives.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1159    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 10:58:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My entire family has been camping, fishing and canoeing on the Current and Jacks fork river since late 1960's. When I made my first trip down the Current it was still a state park. I am a Registered Professional Engineer in Illinois and have a working knowledge of water quality. Also my favorite thing to do in the river is snorkel.

Since 1968 I can say I have not seen a noticeable degradation of the rivers. I will admit the water does get murky on crowded weekends but you can snorkel the next morning and the visibility is near clear again.

It would be nice if the river was a little less crowded on the major weekends but I would hate to see more restrictions put on the river and deny anyone a chance to see and use the beautiful river system. We have simply started going during the week to avoid the crowds. And if you want the rivers entirely to yourself go in January. It is a whole new experience.

When we first visited the area we camped at Round Springs until the NPS moved most of the camp sites away and out of site of the river. We now camp at Circle B in Enemence. I will say I would rather stay there with a full camp ground than at the off river NPS sites. When we go down to the river we usually go with a large family group and the small NPS sites don't work.

In closing my comment is leave the river open to as many people as possible. Don't make it an exclusive river for a few people who don't want to see another person all day on the river or a few NPS operators who can charge gouging prices like many of the other National Park vendors do. Keep in mind the river system is mainly rock and water both very durable items. I strongly feel the river should stay accessible and affordable to all people who want to use it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1160    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 11:00:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of Alternative A for the Ozark Riverways. I have been floating and camping on these rivers for almost 40 yrs and consider these rivers to be our state's greatest treasures. I appreciate the protections provided by the National Park Service and am saddened at the condition of our other waterways not afforded the same protection. These parks are for everyone, not just the lucky few that live in close proximity. Thank you for your continued management of these vital national riverways.

Sincerely,

Craig Brewer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1161    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 11:11:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** No changes for horse access!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1162    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 11:22:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please don't not change any of the horse trail access! Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1163 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 11:36:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Do not close anymore trails, we already are crowded out by city life. Horses and riders need safe places filled with nature to ride relax and train.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1164 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 12:19:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This is a very comprehensive and well developed plan and explanation. The National Parks Service did a great job with this document. I agree that this Park has been abused by many visitors and something must be done to protect the beauty and sustainability of this area before it is ruined. I am a regular visitor and am appalled to see what is happening at these riverways. Alternative B seems to make the most sense with a balance of preservation, conservation and recreation. Alternative C should be out of the question. Honestly, enforcing rules that are already in place, would be a big step in the right direction. Littering, illegal roads, and polluting the water with gasoline are some of the biggest problems, and are all already illegal.

I understand that many people who live close to the park are against any rules at all, but as a taxpayer and Missouri Resident who frequently visits our wonderful outdoor areas, my opinion should count just as much. I live near the Mississippi River, and that doesn't give me license to abuse that river, pollute it, or destroy the riverbanks and landscapes. Similarly, ozark residents shouldn't be allowed to destroy our National natural treasures just because they happen to reside close by

Thank you for all the time and effort you have put into this project.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1165 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The most important starting point is what the original park plan was intended to be and laid out and to restore that - but perhaps only for a few years. That would require closing all illegal access points and trails. Maintaining them as closed except for specifically permitted, guided activities will allow the park to recover from the years of an increasing level of unauthorized use. It recognizes the need to put the park back into a sustainable condition as the first step.

Designating as a wilderness the Big Spring Wilderness Study Area and enforcing that designation preserves a benchmark for what the original system was like against which to measure the effect of returning to the original park plan.

After three years, the closure of illegal access points and trails should be revisited to see what patterns of use have developed because of the return to the original plan. Any changes in that original plan can then be properly assessed in terms of habitat preservation, public enjoyment and sustainability, and the showing for any such changes must be convincing and supported by substantial evidence and reason.

This comment is in effect support for Alternative A with an option after three years to assess the need for changing it to accomodate some of the factors in Alternative B.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1166 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 12:45:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

As a life long Missouri resident, I am opposed to any further attempts by the federal government to "manage" our Missouri natural resources! Too often, the term "manage" is a euphemism for "wrest control from the people." If any actual management needs to take place, Missouri's own Department of Conservation is most capable of assessing

and implementing the necessary strategy. Big government and environmental clubs are neither needed nor wanted. Leave our streams and rivers alone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1167 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 12:53:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Leave the National Park just as it is do not change it. The people of Dent County and all other countries that is on Current River need it and would like for it to not to be changed. This park helps employ a lot of people and jobs are need bad in this area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1168 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 12:59:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a local resident, it would be great to be able to use the river in the winter months (off season for tourism) to continue the heritage and values of river living that has been passed down to me , and that I pass on to my children and others, such as trapping, gigging, fishing, and wildlife watching. Being able to use a motor boat for these activites as a family gets my children involved in preserving our culture and instills values that drugs and harmful recreation can't.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1169 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 13:09:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I feel that local people are not the reason that the river is changing. When there are about 800 canoes on a saturday between May and September being put in for floaters to enjoy the river, that brings alot of impact to how the river is changing. Seeing the river everyday, you notice that the most damage is done during tourism season.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1170 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 13:14:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** ALTHOUGH I PREFER LEAVING THE MANAGEMENT PLAN AS IT NOW EXISTS, IF CHANGES MUST BE MADE, I PREFER OPTION C.

MY OPINION IS: IF IT'S NOT BROKEN, DON'T FIX IT.

ALTHOUGH MINOR PROBLEMS NOW OCCUR, THEY CAN BE CORRECTED, AND THE OFFENDERS TICKETED OR ARRESTED.

MOST VIOLATIONS ON THE RIVER ARE COMMITTED BY FLOATERS AS OPPOSED TO BOATERS.

MANY PEOPLE USE THE RIVERS IN THE ONSR FOR RECREATION, AS OUTLINED IN THE ORIGINAL LEGISLATION. DON'T PUNISH ALL USERS BECAUSE A FEW INCONSIDERATE PEOPLE ABUSE THE SYSTEM.

THANKS FOR ALLOWING THE COMMENT PERIOD.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1171 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 13:17:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Local people are made to feel that we are the enemy by the park service...this is the only national park I have been in that the rangers act like they are above the law. They live here and should try to

compromise with a plan that makes everyone feel welcome.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1172    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 13:19:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** God's will be done

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1173    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 13:22:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support alternative B as a preferred management plan by the nps.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1174    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 13:22:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Ozark Nationa Scenic Riverways have been abused for years. I strongly urge the maximum protection be implemented to reduce and minimize such abuse. I support and recommend that Plan A be adopted.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1175    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 13:30:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I WOULD PREFER TO NOT CHANGE ANY OF THE EXISTING RULES GOVERNING USE OF OUR RIVERS WITHIN THE ONSR. HOWEVER, I REALIZE YOU ARE UNDER PRESSURE TO MAKE CHANGES. IF CHANGES MUST BE MADE, I WOULD PREFER OPTION C, WITH EMPHASIS ON THE ONSR BEING USED FOR RECREATION, AS PROMISED IN THE ORIGINAL LEGISLATION.

ALTHOUGH I BELIEVE IN CONSERVATION, I HAVE TO ASK WHO ARE WE CONSERVING THE RIVERS FOR IF NO ONE IS ALLOWED ACCESS TO THEM?

THE RIVERS REMAIN CLEAR AND BEAUTIFUL WITH USE AS IT IS TODAY. THERE IS NO REASON TO CREATE AND MAGNIFY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN USERS OF MOTOR BOATS AND FLOATERS. THE TWO GROUPS CAN WORK TOGETHER AS IS CURRENTLY THE CASE MOST OF THE TIME. WHEN EITHER GROUP ABUSES THE ONSR AREA, PLEASE CONTINUE THE POLICY OF TICKETING OR ARRESTING VIOLATORS. MOST USERS REALIZE THE MAJORITY OF LITTERING AND EXCESSIVE DRINKING IS DONE BY FLOATERS, WHILE MOTOR BOATERS GET THE WORST PUBLICITY.

IT IS ALSO IMPORTANT TO POINT OUT THAT MOST RIVER USERS CAN TELL YOU ABOUT A FLOATER RESCUE BY A MOTOR BOATER.

THANKS FOR ALLOWING COMMENTS.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1176    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 13:41:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a lifelong Missouri resident I am wholeheartedly in favor of the NPS to continue its management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). National Parks are our nation's gems and I am proud to have this unique national park system in Missouri. I have been a frequent user since 1969. The establishment of a Friends group for ONSR - - especially with planned giving opportunities - - may help bridge the divide between local residents who live by the park and other users by providing more resources for its management and improvements. I for one would contribute.

The problems I have seen over the years have been the increased weekend use and abuse of the rivers by canoeists, and in some cases motorized boat operators who do not practice courtesy to their fellow floaters. Drunk and disorderly conduct gets out of hand. More limited use through a permit system works for wilderness areas, but would probably not work well for this popular area. I recognize that there is a limit on the number of canoes

available to outfitters, and that probably is the best compromise. Continued monitoring how many are permitted is recommended. Increased patrols of the rivers on high use days would help.

My biggest gripe is the semi-primitive campsites such as Bay Creek and Rymers. Neither are safe for individual campers (or families with children) anymore. One major reason for this is increased Meth use (including cooking meth), and alcohol use. Two things I would recommend are: one, eliminate the first-come-first-served system and establish a reservation system for these types of campsites. The second would be to increase patrols, and perhaps develop a system of volunteer camp hosts (partner with groups like Sierra Club) who would camp for one week at the sites to oversee and report any problems to the park service.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1177 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 14:41:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have lived among the Current and Jacks Fork rivers for 38 years. All I knew before getting married was to swim at Alley Springs. After I married my in-laws always camped biggest part of the summer on these rivers. We swam, fished and motored up and down with family and friends. Many places along these rivers I have fond memories of. It was always looked forward to summer and vacation time with relatives and friends. Stories of old and making more memories. Latest of all these was under the sinkin bridge on 19 highway. The family took up the whole place under there with campers and tents. My children learned to swim and fish there. More than One birthday was celebrated on the banks of Sinkin Creek. Soon we had to start paying to camp there and then my in-laws passed away and they closed off where we couldn't get in anymore. It is sad that we could not pass this tradition on to our grandchildren. Now it is hard to even find a spot that is not trashed by tourists, you cannot take your kids to the river without the rude and foul language of indecent people. My children also learned of family time when learning to gig. Could not wait for gigging season. With all the limitations and restrictions going on I'm afraid these precious teaching and family traditions are slowly being taken away from us.

I am all for preserving the environment, but who will be there to enjoy any of it if it cannot be enjoyed and shared by those of us alive to pass down. It is very sad that we have to suffer for those that ruin or want control. It is sad that there is no respect for anything anymore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1178 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 14:43:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Planning for preservation is vital to our natural world, -our only home in all the universe. Man is by nature self centered. The pursuit of personal pleasure or profit is blind to the desperate need for conservation. Therefore when tearing up the terrain on ATV's, or shorelines on speedboats or jet ski's, or clearcutting forested areas for timber profits, or fouling the waters or trashing the land with affluent and waste, or lobbying on behalf of this, is an extension of the self centered activities, whether landowner or recreational visitor or political ally, the inclination is blind to efforts or reason to speak in terms of preservation or conservation or national trust, or future generations. The need therefore is paramount to provide and establish guidelines and discipline in the use and treatment of our national and local natural resources. Truth be told there is no benefit, to anyone, for "ownership" to equate to a "right" or "entitlement" to spoil and destroy by persistent self centered pursuits that ruinously impact on the soil, waters and air of this planet. I support with little reservation the necessity of planned management of our Ozark National Scenic Riverways as the requirements of a national public trust on behalf of us all.

Most Sincerely  
Ronald L.Pohle  
Saint Louis, Missouri

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1179 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 14:44:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Overall i am a supporter two philosophies, let the locals make decisions and keep our lives free from as many regulations and rules as possible.

I think the park service should incorporate the locals input. The Feds provide great resources to put a project like this together BUT. Let the local people have a lot of input. They live there.

Alternatives - there are so many details etc. 40 horse/jet. DriVing to this gravel bar or that one. Let the locals decide.

Alcohol - just have water patrol enforce common courtesy and the laws already in existence. You can't go anywhere else in your birthday suit or not be expected to get asked to leave or locked up for inappropriate behavior elsewhere, just keep up the patrols and peer pressure so that people don't treat the river like spring break.

I've floated as a kid, as a drunken college student, and as a parent. Enjoyed all the trips.

If you are asking for a choice of plan, I'd pick C as a base and make changes as the locals see fit.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1180 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 14:54:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alternative A. ATVs, horse trails, all the trappings of "civilization" will only destroy mountain streams and ecosystems. NPS needs to step up to the plate and save the Ozarks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1181 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 14:59:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I urge NPS to go with Alternative A to protect the area for future generations to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1182 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 15:09:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thanks for considering mountain biking and other trail uses within the General Management Plan. I urge you to give increased consideration for mountain biking in this and future plans. I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways, and urge you to allow mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in this and future plans, wherever possible and appropriate.

Well-designed mountain bike trails are sustainable and do not have adverse environmental impacts when properly constructed in the right locations. In fact, their environmental impact is often far lower than other trail options such as equestrian.

I feel the current situation, with mountain biking disallowed on all existing trails and bicycling on area roads discouraged, does not allow visitors the full range of recreation options that are normally available at similar state and national parks across the nation. Allowing substantial mountain bike access in areas where it is appropriate would be a very important improvement in this area.

Missouri has a large and active mountain biking population that will very much use and appreciate these trails and access to this beautiful area, if it is provided.

I encourage you to involve bicycling and mountain biking groups when making decisions about trail access in the Scenic Riverways area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1183 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 15:12:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** After reviewing your proposals, I suggest that you implement Option 2 to help with the overuse of the Ozark Riverways National Park. Without more controls, our pristine rivers will become more polluted, overfished, and over-used to where they could lose their value. I utilize this Park annually, but have cut back due to overcrowding and general rowdiness of many of the floaters. Your assistance is appreciated.



Mike Tevlin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1184    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 15:26:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Your recommended Alternative B would be a positive step forward for our Scenic Rivers, a welcome change from the status quo. I would actually recommend Alternative A, since it provides better protections for sustainable future use of the rivers. This option would close illegal roads restoring 50 miles to nature, close 65 miles of undesignated horse trails with no new stream crossings and bar all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

This park was originally created for people to enjoy the unique natural springs, caves and entire river ecosystem, not to create a sort of amusement park around the rivers. Moving away from the original purpose over the years has been detrimental to life on the river. There is much more noise, scenic disturbance and uncontrolled development. The park wasn't meant to provide for ATV's and trucks that tear up gravel bars and ground along the rivers. Nor was it meant for noisy motorboats to zip by swimmers disturbing the peace and endangering their safety. It wasn't meant for thousands of horses to criss-cross the rivers leaving feces that also threatens swimmers with E. Coli contamination. All this with the proliferation of illegal access roads, ten times what there was supposed to be, has caused erosion, which smothers the insects in the river bed which feed the animals on up the food chain. It also causes invasion of alien species which can eventually ruin the unique web of life.

It is time for real change and real management of these amazing rivers and their surroundings. I urge you to choose alternative A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1185    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 15:32:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,  
Thanks for giving us the opportunity to comment.

The rivers affected by these plans are a precious natural resource. They should be protected to a very large degree, but reasonable, none destructive use should be allowed.

Our family has been on many float and camping trips on these rivers over the past forty years. During this time, much has happened to degrade these rivers and the overall experience, such as the uncivilized behavior and the litter cast off by the large floating party groups that now clog these rivers and the ATV river crossings creating noise and destroying habitat. I would hope the plan, that is selected, would help improve these conditions, while minimizing the financial hardship to the locals who make a living off these rivers.

The local residents and businesses affected by these plans, must come to realize that we must have limits; else, these natural resources will go the way of the wholesale destruction of the Ozark forests in the 1800s. We can not kill the Goose that lays the golden eggs!

Alternative B seems like a fairly good balance.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1186    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 16:32:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** A comment in support of allowing mountain biking on some Ozark National Scenic Riverways trails, from a long time user of the facilities provided by NPS in the area:

Limited, well-designed mountain bike trails can be sustainable and have no adverse environmental impact when properly sited and constructed. A properly maintained MTB accessible trail has lower impact than some other trail uses, including those frequented by equestrian users, ATVs and other motorized vehicles.

Missouri has several volunteer driven cycling groups that can assist the NPS in the conversion of existing trails to sustainable MTB accessible trails, as well as the siting and construction of MTB specific trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1187 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 16:57:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** First of all, I do not live in Kansas, but I could not get your state list to move to Missouri. I have read the A, B and C draft documents of plans for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and I favor plan A because it is the most restrictive on motorized transportation. To begin with, ATVs have no place on or close to these rivers. That's just like letting sno mobiles into Yellowstone. Both these means of transport are noisy and destroy the peace of countryside. Likewise, noisy boats should also be removed from the rivers. Those who are physically unable to canoe or kayak can fish or get up and down the rivers with a small, trolling motor. I have a horse (but no trailer so I have never been on the trail rides out of Eminence). I sympathize with the horse people but also know that horses can really tear up trail (and the river bottom) especially in large numbers. So I think they should be kept out of the river as much as possible. I like your idea of controlling access points for the canoe traffic so that big clots of canoes won't develop. I wish liquor could be banned to reduce public drunkenness. It's a sad fact that many people go on the rivers not to enjoy nature and peace and quiet but to get drunk as skunks. Certainly destroys the peace and quiet for others. I think you should have had more meetings in the St. Louis area and in Kansas City - even in IL, Ia, KS and AR. I read in the paper that the locals are crying about having "outside" people set the agenda for "their" rivers. This is the same crap we heard when the KATY Trail was being developed. If left solely to the people down there you'd find a hell of a lot of cows standing around in the river. That's what I saw when I canoed there before it was a National Park.

Carole Courson  
,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1188 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 17:23:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hats off to the National Park Service for trying to rein in the monster that has been created by decades of benign neglect along the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. As a resident of St. Louis, I have many happy memories as a child, some 30 years ago, in going on float trips and exploring this beautiful part of our natural heritage. However, I have been dismayed when trying to take my own children to visit this area. Today, it is crowded, over-run by motorboats, ATVs, and all manner of vehicles polluting what was once a pristine natural environment. We were nearly run over by an inexperienced horse rider- -and there now appear to be hundreds of them. In addition to the gasoline guzzlers and horse disasters, the crowds of drunk hooligans tied together in canoe trails some 20 boats long or longer are a terror. We could not enjoy our trip and have not returned since. Does this make me one of the "people living in St. Louis, imposing my views on someone who has to live down river" as quoted in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch? I hardly think so. I live near the Gateway Arch- -another national federal property- -does that mean my opinion on its use should trump all others? No! These amazing properties are part of our NATIONAL patrimony. They belong to all Americans. I strongly support option A of the plans on offer, and I hope the National Park Service will do the right thing to not only protect, but also restore, the Ozard National Scenic Riverways. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1189 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 17:38:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Ozark Riverways is currently overused and abused. Continuing on this 'path' will have long term detrimental effects on the Riverways. I would support the NPS on the issue of improving control over the use of the Riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1190 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 17:41:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in support of Plan A and B. I believe it is extremely important that we limit, or even prevent motorized boats on the rivers. I also am for limiting camping to the campgrounds and not just anywhere on

government land. I also want ATVs to stop destroying lands and riverways. And I am very much for limiting horses and trailriders in the riverways. People in this area do not swim downstream during and after the trail rides here.

Motorized boats are not a part of our history nor heritage. They are a danger to swimmers, kayaks, and canoers. They disrupt the fish and wildlife. People can gig without a motorized boat. They didn't have them 100 years ago.

ATVs on park land and rivers upset me. It is not a tourist thing, it is a local thing. They tear up the land, disrupt wildlife, and their noise are a noisy distraction to hikers and others on the rivers. People on them are usually too fat and lazy to hike. And they drive them illegally on the highways.

Limiting camping to campgrounds make perfect sense to me. Meth is prevalent in this area and I firmly believe it will be used in non camping areas. Also liquor by minors will be used, trash will be left behind and there is a threat of fires. There are plenty of remote camping areas where people aren't packed in together. It will take more tax dollars and manpower to look after those areas.

None of the park service plans will hurt tourism. We rent lodging to tourists and they love the waters, the canoeing, kayaking and the quiet and beauty of the Ozarks. They don't bring ATVs or boats with them.

I am a 6th generation Ozarkian. The park service has provided more access to parts of the river, provided better roads, bathrooms, and they keep the waters pristine. I appreciate all that has been done since they took over. Some of the people think any plan will hurt tourism in our town which is wrong. Greed, high prices of property, and lack of imagination has hurt tourism in Eminence. The park service has helped the economy.

Many of the locals believe these lands belong to them but they belong to ALL Americans. Visitors come here for the rivers, the trails, the scenery. They don't come for cheap goods made in China, or to ride ATVs or motorized boats. They come for the serenity.

Please do not give into the loud locals. Remember that the lands belong to the tourists that come here just as much as it does to the locals. There was a time that human waste from town flowed into the Jacks Fork. This was a part of the 'heritage' here. I love all of our public lands. I appreciate not having ATVs in them. Please know that there is support for a better plan. Thank you for all you do.

And Rep. Jason Smith is a self serving, lying politician. Don't listen to him.

Sincerely,

Rhonda Hunt

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1191	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,26,2014 18:32:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am for the no action alternative. There is enough regulation of the scenic river ways.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1192	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,26,2014 18:44:39				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I've spent nearly every weekend of my summer and most of my weekends throughout the winter on this river since I was a young child! I couldn't imagine what I would do without it and our town and the surrounding towns would go pretty well bankrupt without the river it brings in all kinds of tourist.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1193	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,26,2014 18:51:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I would like to comment on the Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan. I have worked my entire life, including three years in the U. S. Marine Corps. I've paid my dues and I am just looking forward to a simple retirement. All I want to do is put my canoe into the river, float a few miles, catch a few fish for				

supper and go back home. I don't need the National Park Service coming here and telling me when and where I can float and fish our rivers.

After reading the proposed Draft General Management Plan for the National Scenic Riverways, Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, they are planning on closing 20 access points along the river. In fact, they have already closed several access points before the Plan has been approved. Shutting down access to these rivers will have devastating effects on our local economy as well as the local folks that have come here to retire. For decades, the people of Missouri have successfully maintained and preserved the health of the rivers and surrounding areas better than the National Park Service has. Local folks are more than capable of ensuring the health of the rivers, while permitting the public to use and enjoy the land they payed to preserve. I strongly recommend that our state and federal representatives support the No-Action Alternative to prevent unnecessary restrictions on our public lands and waterways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1194    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 18:51:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We need to protect the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for future generations. Multiple uses of the area are possible without impacting the qualities of these watersheds. ATV and other potentially damaging usage needs to be away from the rivers and streams. Canoeing, hiking, birding, and other less damaging usage can be closer to the rivers and streams. We need to think about erosion, water quality, sedimentation and runoff and how those processes impact plant and animal communities, especially aquatic communities. Natural communities once degraded rarely can be restored to the same level of complexity or diversity. Please protect the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and associated areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1195    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 19:08:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I grew up not far from Akers Ferry. My afternoons and weekends were spent in a 25 horse john boat trout fishing with my dad. My greatest memories were created on that river. It is a public area and I should be allowed to raise my children the same way I was raised. Trout fishing up and down the river. During gigging season we would rush home from school and get our homework done early so we could go gigging at night. Some of the greatest wisdom and stories to be traded have been traded in a boat on that river. Don't take these memories from my children.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1196    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 19:11:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I filled out a questionnaire about 3 years ago. I am thinking no one paid any attention to it then. I own a 25 HP boat and motor and do use this end of the river, from Akers Ferry and above. You have already taken it away for us in the Summer, now you are trying to take it away altogether. There are several people in the Summersville, Hartshorn, Raymondville, Timber, and Salem area that own 25 HP boat and motors that like to gig and trout fish from their boats on this end of the river.

I have heard it said that "Everyone can still do what they did before, they will just have to driver further to do it."

Well, that is not true. The Missouri Department of Conservation does not stock the river with trout below Akers Ferry. My children grew up on this end of the river, trout fishing and gigging. I would love to see my grandchildren have this same opportunity.

There is enough room on the river for everyone to use. Stop catering to the tourist that come here and rent canoes and trash up the river with their beer cans, trash and filthy language. Keep this end of the river opened for the locals to use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1197    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 19:24:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, where it is appropriate in consideration of other uses and where the trails are properly constructed. I appreciate the attention given to and consideration for mountain biking and other trail uses within the General Management Plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1198 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 19:39:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We have been floaters on the Current and Jacks Fork for over 60 years. Experiencing these rivers has been high on our list of what we love about living in Missouri. Over the years the quality of this experience has diminished in direct proportion to the degradation of this magnificent resource. The number of users has exploded as have the intrusions of motorized vehicles on gravel bars and loud jet boats on what used to be quiet stretches of the rivers. In heavily used areas the banks have eroded. and concentrations of horses have caused contamination. We only float during the week now to avoid the crowds but this luxury is only possible if one is retired.

On Wednesday night we drove to the open house at Powder Valley but were told by a ranger that the building was at capacity and that we would not be able to go inside. Furthermore there was no parking in the nature center lot because a group from the Ozarks parked trucks with boat trailers to make it more difficult to park. We were sorry to miss the open house and meeting that followed. It was the only meeting in a city outside of the ozark region which seemed to give into those who have never accepted that the river is a National Park and belongs to all of us.

The Park Service should be congratulated on the draft plan. Alternative B addresses most of the problems. One area of continued concern is the violation of scenic easements. As difficult as it must be to police this long narrow corridor, these easements violations must be corrected promptly. It would be great to have even more that 15 miles of hiking trails. Finally, Horse campsites should be located outside the park area where they would have less impact. We support Alternative B which seems to be an acceptable middle ground.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1199 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 20:48:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I had the wonderful experience of spending a weekend touring the Ozark Springs. What an incredible natural resource. Please keep nature natural. Protect the springs. Lose all the other stuff. Thank you. SierraSu

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1200 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 21:37:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm for the no action alternative and here is why

1. If the rules that are there were enforced better the issues might disappear.
2. I truly don't understand how taking my boat off the river is going to improve anything. Erosion is going to happen if my 40 horse motor is there or not its called flooding.
3. If horse crap is such a problem then are you going to shoot the wild horses and get rid of the elk cause I'm sure they use it as a bathroom too.
4. Why does it seem that locals are being targeted? Why should the canoes and tubes have more rights than the people who are here year round.
5. My family and I frequent the cardareva section of the river and we have little to no horses in this area. There are no low water traffic crossings. We have very few canoes or tubes on this section. So why should we lose out on the use of the park. The rangers already enforce the no utvs or atvs on the gravel bars (which I think is stupid) but rules are there for a reason.
6. There are three weekends a yesr when or section of the river is busy but other wise its pretty calm.
7. Why can't you show us any real proof that there are true problems. Trust me are not going to just take your word for it.
8. If our congressmen and state leaders are not willing to side with you how can you do anything.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1201 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 21:56:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I really hope that you open up this park to mountain biking. It is a fun and healthy exercise for all ages and will increase tourism in the area. There is no negative in doing this. I think you will be surprised by how

many more visitors you will get.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1202 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208 **Private:** Y  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This country is in pretty sad shape, we have a white house full of greedy politicians that are selling this country out . Now we have a park service that is trying to keep us from useing our parks, or at least some of us. I read an article not long ago that said missouri had 87 state parks and historic sites . The article was telling missourians to go out visit and enjoy our senic and wonderful state parks. They were talking about all missourians, not a select few. Our parks and riverways are for everyone's use, not a select few. How can you start limiting access to some of us, because we ride a horse or drive an off road vehicle, or want to ride the river in a boat! You people need to remind theese Clubs and Environmental groups that all this land is ours to enjoy the same as it is there's. I understand that you have to have certain rules and regulations but to start cutting out use of these areas. (to some and not others), is not fair. If you start here in the ozarks then where next. Asking that you remember all the people and not just some of the people when you make decisions concerning OUR parks. Thank You for your time and would ask that you don't let out my information. Jim Redmond

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1203 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 06:20:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The State of Missouri has an excellent Department of Conservation that is above and beyond that of most states in our union. I feel strongly that control of the Current River,Jacks Fork River,AND ALL MISSOURI rivers, should be under their control and guidance AND NOT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. The U.S. federal government has no skin in the game and should not allow the Sierra Club to dictate their decisions. These rivers spring forth from Missouri soil therefore they should not be under federal control they should be controlled by the Missouri Department of Conservation. This is just another case of eminent domain by the federal government.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1204 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 07:44:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alternative A, which provides the greatest protection for the park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1205 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 09:06:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am for the 2nd proposal which will offer more protection of our scenic riverways that I have been using now for over 40 years. It is very important to me that these rivers stay clear and filled with native fish and organisms. The overuse of motorized vehicles has long been a concern.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1206 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 09:06:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to see plan A go into effect. We can not protect our wilderness areas enough. NO MOTOR BOATS !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1207 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 09:08:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I love our streams and do not want to see another Lake of the ozarks!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1208 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 09:11:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** National Parks Service

Re: Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan

Dear Superintendent,

I'm moved to send commentary on the proposed alternatives for the Ozarks Scenic Riverways by an article that appeared on today's (January 26) front page of the Sunday St. Louis Post-Dispatch. The article begins with a farmer at an NPS meeting in Salem expressing his dismay about possible new restrictions on motorboats and limitations on horseback riding and the closing of unauthorized roads that his family and friends had used for years to reach the rivers' gravel banks. The gentleman told the reporter that "The regulations they got now are more than enough. I think they need to leave us alone."

Unfortunately, the existing regulations are not nearly enough, as the ongoing degradation of our rivers dramatically illustrates. If the gentleman featured in the Post-Dispatch article had his way, the future of our rivers would be bleak indeed. The No-action Alternative is not acceptable.

The recreational activities listed in the newspaper that the disgruntled farmer and his family and friends are enjoying come at the expense of the health of these once pristine waterways. Motorboats produce emissions and exhaust and noise, not to mention immediate physical effects from propellers and turbulence. Water clarity and water quality are affected and the growth of algae and shoreline erosion encouraged and aquatic plant and animal life damaged.

Horseback riding accelerates bank erosion rates and damages plant life and horse manure not only deposits bacteria in and along the waterway but also introduces seeds not native to the riverway. Breeding species of native and migrating wildlife are susceptible to disturbance by both motorboat and horses. Unauthorized roads invite use by all-terrain vehicles which are destructive of the habitat they travel over and which introduce many of the same kinds of pollution as motorboats do. Because of the destruction caused by these activities and the promise of yet "higher levels of social interaction with other visitors," I also find Alternative C to be unacceptable.

Of the two remaining plans, it is my hope that the NPS adopts Alternative A.

I have had the extreme joy of floating some of our state's rivers over a period of three decades. The Current has been a favorite for floating and gravel bar camping. Traveling by canoe, seeing the world pass in slow motion, hearing birds calls, and watching a great blue heron rising up over the water - this may be the best that Missouri has to offer. I've also felt dismay at seeing Missouri rivers misused - used with callow disregard for the effects on nature that human behavior can cause. So I learned that spring and fall floats were best and weekday floats ideal. No enhancements or facilities were needed to make those experiences unforgettable.

I am a firm proponent of access to our rivers - others should enjoy what I have had the good fortune to experience. I don't believe the Ozark National Scenic Riverways or present and future generations of folks who want to enjoy our rivers will be served well by increased commercialization. I doubt that even the introduction of facilities could enhance rather than detract from the natural experience. I favor Plan A.

Thank you for your consideration.

Margaret Hermes

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1209	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,27,2014 09:12:27
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	There is already enough regulations,just inforce the ones you have. The people that live in this area should have more say about what goes on,than someone someone that visits the area once a year.
------------------------	--

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1210	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,27,2014 09:15:43
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I would like plan A keep our streams clean.
------------------------	---

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1211	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,27,2014 09:17:23
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Plan A is the safest way to keep our streams clean.
------------------------	---

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1212	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,27,2014 09:18:33
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** My comments apply specifically to Alternate B which is the NPS preferred alternative.

Current River access: I would like to see commercial floater access to the river at Baptist Camp and Tan Vat eliminated and commercial floating above Cedar Grove eliminated as well. The river from Tan Vat to Cedar Grove offers wonderful fishing, birdwatching and primitive camping opportunities which are spoiled by groups of commercial floaters passing through. For example, floaters can spoil fishing for an hour or more after their passage and the noise they make ruins the experience for those seeking the solitude of time on the river.

Horse Trails: I would like to see the number of crossing reduced. From my own experience, those trails become deeply rutted and add sediment to the stream after heavy rains. Alternatively, if the existing trails could be graded to eliminate runoff and manure managed that would be acceptable, but I would not like to see more crossings added.

Limited Gravel Bar Camping: This was a bit unclear. If the intent was to limit camping from vehicles on gravel bars such as occurs at Parker Hollow then I am in favor of that condition. If the intent was to limit the number of gravel bars upon which a floater could camp then I am not in favor.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1213    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 09:25:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in favor of Alternative A in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan/Wilderness Study/EIS.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1214    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 09:47:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The ONSR is a national park and should be protected as such. The reason for national parks, in my opinion, is to prevent "local" interests from development that would in any shape or form endanger the park's resources.

Our group has floated these rivers for over forty years and are grateful for the opportunity to enjoy such a natural area close to home. We do however lament the fact that we have witnessed the rivers being abused by motorized vehicles, unfettered access that results in litter and damage, and the illegal fishing by the local population. I have visited many national parks and the access allowed, especially to the Jacks Fork, would not be tolerated elsewhere.

If you look south to the Buffalo National River you see limited access points, strict management of trails, and well managed campgrounds that have river access.

My simple comment would be to limit access to the rivers by authorized roads only so that the areas can be maintained and managed properly. The alternative is what we see on all of our trips to the river: ATV's on gravel bars and navigating the rivers. Large piles of trash, which we always remove, left by individuals who drive to the river. The uncomfortable situation of having individuals overlooking our campsites that have driven to the area, and in some cases have thrown rocks from bluffs towards our camp. This has happened on numerous occasions at Chalk Bluff and is extremely dangerous.

Thank you and please feel free to contact me.  
Edward Furey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1215    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 09:52:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I prefer the No Action Alternative Plan with the the following modifications:

1. Enforce the littering laws we currently have. As a member of Back Country Horsemen, I have worked picking up trash along the Current River. There is NO trash on trails leading to the upper Current River. You don't have much room on your saddle to carry objects in, leading me to believe it's the river traffic that is causing the littering problem. Existing littering laws NEED to be enforced!



2. Create more Designated Horse Trails. Closing trails (either designated or not) will only funnel more traffic onto the existing trails. If the deterioration of trails is the issue - we need more trails not less.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1216    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 10:42:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly support Plan A as the best alternative to protect and preserve the beauty of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I have been floating the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers for more than 30 years - along with many other rivers and streams throughout Missouri. In that time I have become distressed about the degradation of the Current and Jack's Fork from overuse, litter, pollution from horses and cattle and motorboats. We typically try to avoid busy weekends when scheduling float trips in order to avoid hordes of drunk teenagers and obnoxious locals who fly down the rivers with outboard motors and loud boomboxes that destroy the peace and quiet we seek. In fact, we tend to restrict our floats to the Jack's Fork because the Current has become so overcrowded. We rarely encounter motorboats on the Jack's Fork due to lower water levels; those we do encounter on the Jack's Fork tend to be older, serious canoeists who eschew boomboxes and giant coolers full of enough beer for an entire football team. We also find little trash along the Jack's Fork and happily pick up any trash we find. I fear that loosening restrictions on these two waterways will lead to further degradation of both, similar to what is occurring on rivers like the Meramec and the Huzzah. There are entire sections of the Meramec where we refuse to get out of our canoes to swim due to the proximity of large cattle farms that border the river, while the Huzzah and others have basically become locations for weekend frat parties. Motorboats have no place on the Current and Jack's Fork; trolling motors for fishermen are fine, but large outboards churn up the bottoms of the rivers, create noise pollution and can be hazardous to canoeists (we've nearly capsized several times because boat operators fail to slow down as they approach us). Limiting the amount of alcohol each person can pack for a float also would help reduce some of the obnoxious behavior we have witnessed over the years - litter, fights, nudity, yelling and cussing and everything else associated with inebriated youth. I once witnessed a large group of underage drinkers toss all of their beer cans into the Courtois when agents appeared on the shore; I crossed the swollen river to pick up more than two dozen cans that afternoon. We will never go back to that river. Please, for the sake of future generations, do everything in your power to protect and preserve the Current and Jack's Fork. I only wish the same restrictions could be applied to all rivers and streams in Missouri.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1217    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 10:46:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear NPS

I am strongly in favor of Plan A. I understand the local's objections to interference with their commerce that is largely dependent on the tourism that the rivers draw. I have been a regular floater on these and other rivers in MO for 50 yrs and am appalled at the increasingly obvious abuse that our scenic rivers have endured. The numbers of people, boats, trash and degradation of the gravel bars that are prevalent on the Current, Jacks Fork, Black and Meramec Rivers is untenable.

To those whose livelihood is attached to these rivers, I say: who will be able to enjoy these natural resources in the next 50 yrs if we do not take care of them? We are so blessed to have such gems available to us and need to practice better stewardship so as to preserve the waters and the adjacent environment.

Please do the right thing and be a part of the solution and not complicit in the ruin of our rivers.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Greminger

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1218    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 11:08:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a regular visited to the ONSR and enjoy the beauty of the area very much. I feel the National Park Service is the best organization to manage the rivers and lands and they have done a decent job managing the park over the last several decades. I do agree with the people and groups who feel that change is needed in order to best preserve the natural beauty of the area for the future generations to come.

Currently, I visit the park in the spring and fall months as to avoid the huge groups of floaters that enjoy partying and socializing and that type of environment. I am the type of park user that enjoys camping, hiking, nature watching, canoeing and just enjoying the park in a more peaceful setting.

I happen to side with the NPS recommendations (plan B) and feel this will bring the best balance of sustainability and user enjoyment for the park and its visitors. I have read through a big portion of the management plans, however, I have not seen anything regarding light pollution (please forgive me if it is there and I have missed it).

I would like to make a recommendation that some kind of light pollution plan be included, with the future management plan, to ensure that the night skies can remain as pristine as the landscapes of the area. ONSR and the surrounding areas are one of the few locations in Missouri, and in the eastern portion of the United States for that matter, that still have decent night skies with very low light pollution levels. In my opinion, preserving the night sky adds to the overall natural experience of the wildness and light pollution is something that is causing the night skies to rapidly disappear from the United States. I fear that my young son may not get the opportunity to teach his son about the night sky when he eventually becomes a father himself, years from now. I would like to recommend that ONSR limit the use of lighting whenever possible. When lighting is needed perhaps the NPS can use directional light fixtures to help reduce wasted light traveling upwards into the sky. Conceivably ONSR could work with the surrounding communities and together they could develop a plan for the entire region. I am aware that the NPS is familiar with light pollution and they have enacted policies in some of their other parks (e.g. Arches National Park). Maybe a similar plan can be adopted for ONSR.

Thank you for taking the time to read my comment.

Sincerely,  
Chris Grunwald

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1219	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,27,2014 11:47:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** In regards to the GMP of the ONSR, I want to express my concern with the proposed changes. I strongly support the NO ACTION alternative. We have been told that the no action is not an alternative, why is it listed on the plan? It should be taken into consideration because even if it is the least restrictive, it is still restrictive. My husband and I own a business, therefore, we don't take vacations. Relaxing at the river is our vacation. He was born on the land that is now ONSR, on his family's property. His grampa owned farmland that the park service wanted, so they paid him a fraction of what it was worth and took it. Grampa was a river guide, taking folks from other areas on the river for fishing and relaxation, his son, grandson and great grandson did the same. So the river is in their blood. Now the property is in the ONSR, we have paid taxes to help maintain it, we have also picked up trash and worked to keep the river beautiful after the thousands of tourists visit our river. In our family we have disabled veterans, we also have handicapped, wheelchair bound members that could not enjoy the parks beauty without a motorboat or UTV. Should they be penalized because they cannot walk or hike? Our family uses the ONSR to relax and have recreation year around, but with all the restrictions in the different alternatives, we are being punished by not allowing us to use the property that we pay taxes on. There should not be bans on motorized watercraft. We have all replaced our bigger motors with smaller already. Now the plan is wanting to go to smaller motors again. A family of 4 isn't going to the river to race, it is just about getting over the shoals safely when a much smaller motor would not be able to achieve.

I am a U.S. citizen and enjoy the freedoms that come along with that privilege and those privileges come with a price. I am a tax payer that helps fund these programs that you are proposing to implement. We should still have the right to use and enjoy the land that once belonged to our family.

I hope this is read with an open mind and common sense wins as this decision is being made. Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1220	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 11:49:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I love the Ozark Scenic Riverways and have spent many a great weekend with family and friends on the rivers. I endorse Alternative A as a way to preserve the area and maintain the rivers for generations to come. I understand the economy of the area and that tourism provides needed dollars to the region. But I am sure there are other ways to attract tourist that are in concert with nature. The restrictions proposed as part of Alternative A will help improve the waters of the region and deserve my support. thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1221 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 12:31:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm for plan B or even plan A. The long-term environment and also economic viability as a tourist attraction, as well as the enjoyment of current and future residents will be optimized by managing the area in a sustainable manner. This sometimes means making tough decisions that people can't keep doing exactly what they are used to, if it damages the area the NPS is supposed to be protecting. The area needs to be user-friendly, but it also needs to be protected for the next generations to enjoy it also.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1222 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 12:51:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I just found out that you had added the a meeting in Eminence. This Park belongs to the nation not just the local people and you should also add meetings outside of the area to the list!! What about Springfield, Columbia, Kansas City! I know people that come from that area to spend there money and enjoy this Park! Delay the meeting deadline and hold meetings in those city's and make sure that there is some way to make sure that parking is available for boats and people or a way to control parking. That way they can't stop people from attending. A lot of the locals are afraid to comment because they don't want anyone to know they support the park. When I see that the Shannon Co. Sheriff's official truck is used to tow a boat up to St. Louis I can now understand their fear!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1223 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 13:16:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to thank the National Park Service for doing such a good job with the Draft GMP for the ONSR. Your recommended Alternative B would be a positive step forward from the status quo. With my experience having relatives in the area and having visited these rivers for 50 years, I would have to recommend Alternative A, since it provides better protections for sustainable future use of the rivers. This option would close illegal roads restoring 50 miles to nature, close 65 miles of undesignated horse trails with no new stream crossings and bar all recreational vehicle access to gravel bars.

Thanks for your attention to this matter,

Stephen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1224 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 13:24:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have significant experiences visiting National Parks in Colorado, Utah, Arizona, Florida, Arkansas and of course, Missouri's Scenic Riverways.

I visit ONSR 5-6 times a year and have done so for the past 40 years. Currently, on average, each visit generates \$300 for lodging, \$150 for restaurants and grocery stores, and a \$45 fill-up at a local filling station for an average total expenditure of \$490 or, approximately, \$2500 per year.

Most of my Riverways visits include floating the Current River from Tan Vat to Round Spring and/or the Jacks Fork River from 17 Bridge to Eminence. In the summer, I fish and snorkel the rivers, as well as birding and hiking.

I support the adoption of the GMP alternative B, in its entirety, and strongly recommend the addition of language that would serve to prevent any unauthorized road or trail creation to serve as precedent for any legislative or enforcement barriers that allow users to define access points by continued unauthorized use.

Additionally, I urge the adoption of a framework to broaden the restoration and protection of areas adjacent to the riverbanks to allow for ongoing habitat requirements as river channel changes occur. I think that the Big Spring Wilderness designation should not be implemented at this time, but that the land should be maintained as primitive until the trends from Climatic Change are better understood and successful protection protocols identified.

Having attended the public meeting at Powder Valley, and read about the other meetings at which the dialogue was dominated by many of the anti-NPS, anti-Federal government people from the counties where the park is situated, I feel it is important to remind the decision makers of the following:

1. The Missouri state legislature has shown little or no interest in any proposal that require revenues to be generated, even those which are clearly intended to create employment, fund education, or improve public health, even when the funds were offered by the federal government. At the time ONSR was created, the state parks that were transferred to it were done so willingly.
2. There is plenty of data to support the urgency of implementing restrictions referred to in the GMP. All visitors will need to alter their behavior if the resource is to remain as a viable national park. Allowing the river and it's land area to further degrade is an irreversible course of action.
3. One point nearly everyone agrees with is that there must be enforcement of the rules promulgated under the GMP. Clearly, had there been sufficient funding for staff to patrol and close and restore unauthorized trails and roads, the claims of 'tradition' and 'heritage' used as precedent to keep access wide open, could not have emerged as issues for debate. Squatters rights do not exist in National Parks. Whichever alternative is adopted, there must be adequate funding.
4. While the people who live near the park are exceptionally fortunate to have the opportunity to frequently recreate and to have their businesses profit from the ONSR, they do not, as such, derive any priority user status over and above any other U.S. citizen. The park belongs to all U.S. citizens.

Respectfully submitted,  
Doug Brown

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1225	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,27,2014 13:30:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, where it is appropriate in consideration of other uses and where the trails are properly constructed. I appreciate the attention given to and consideration for mountain biking and other trail uses within the General Management Plan.

I am an avid mountain and gravel road biker and would love to have more options available to me for biking other than having to compete with motorized vehicles for the right of way. I enjoy the few trails that are open to us now but, have to travel some distance to get to them and would hope that if more trails open up some might be closer to my location.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1226	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,27,2014 13:33:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern.

For as long as I can remember I have always loved our Missouri waterways. The Current River being one of my and my wife's favorite places to take a float. However, during the past few year we have noticed the degradation of the surrounding area around and on the Current. Trash, rutting from 4x4's, horse droppings, ext. The Current River is

not just something for people who live in the area nether is it for people only in Missouri it is for everyone to see. Although, I am afraid that if the NPS does not do anything to address the serious environmental impacts that the Current is facing now it might be to late for this beautiful watershed. I recommend and am in full agreement with the NPS to approve alternative B. I believe this plan to be in the best interest for EVERYONE. The people who live in the watershed believe that they have clam to the water but this is wrong EVERYONE has clam and alternative B will allow for EVERYONE to enjoy this natural wonder for many years to come. Just as I have been able to enjoy it.

Thanks, Jacob Siech  
The Missouri Coalition for the Environment

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1227    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 13:58:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I hve been canoeing Missouris rivers and streams since the 1960's. I have seen the degradation of the stream and surrounding enviroment, largely trails. The trails have been degraded due to horse traffic. Horse traffic has made some trails almost impassable for normal foot traffic due heavy useage. The use of 4 wheelers on sand bars on the river has degraded the sand bars and the noise pollution resulting from the sound of engines spoils the enjoyment that comes from being in the outdoors.

I don't that maintaining the status quo is acceptable and that option A should be implemented as the new plan for the river.

RBD

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1228    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 14:11:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please find a way to cut down on the number of summer weekend visitors to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The park should be about enjoying nature in a peaceful setting, not a place to get drunk and party. Keep the party crowd out, and a lot of problems will take care of themselves.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1229    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 14:29:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPS,

Well, first off, thank you for taking the time to organize such a lengthy and difficult process. I am sorry that it is so contentious and raises so many hackles, but c'est la vie. This comment is to express my complete support of ALTERNATIVE "A".

Alternative A is exactly what visitors to the ONSR have in mind when they book their trips to the Ozarks: quiet, peace, solitude, relaxation, and a family friendly atmosphere far removed from the ordinary buzz and noise of modern life. However, instead of peace and quiet, visitors to the ONSR are greeted with the roar of ATV's, jet boats, boom boxes, and jacked up trucks parked on gravel bars. I especially like the redistribution of concessions to reduce crowding on the river.

Alternatives B and C fail to adequately protect the very special qualities that make the ONSR a unique and memorable place.

Please understand that the vast majority of Missourians and Out of State visitors fully support Alternative A and are seeking the recreational experience that the founders of the ONSR intended. Every other river way in the state and nation at large do not have the excellent protection of the NPS and they suffer for it. Why would we want to diminish the national park experience on these rivers of international significance? If visitors long so much to use their high horsepower boats and to drive all over the river and floodplain in their ATVs they can very easily go to the Meramec, Big Piney, North Fork, and a dozen other unprotected places. The Current and the Jack's Fork were supposed to be reserved for other, higher uses and enjoyment.

Please do not forget that we are talking about properties of international importance, on par with the Grand Canyon, Yosemite, Crater Lake, etc.

Thank you for your time and consideration and please enact Alternative A.

Best Regards,

J

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1230    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 14:45:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My preferred option is Option A. It seems to give the greatest amount of protection to the resource. My second preference would be Option B. In my view, Option C does NOT give sufficient protection to the river and its surrounding environment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1231    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 15:56:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPS,

As an avid outdoor enthusiast in the Midwest, it is with much concern that I noted that the NPS is planing to virtually ban all recreation on cliff faces and bluffs along the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. In particular, technical climbing is singled out and prohibited in sweeping, loose language that would effectively eliminate most climbing opportunities in the area. In addition, fixed anchors such as bolts are prohibited, further decreasing the opportunities available to Missouri outdoor recreationists.

While Missouri does not enjoy a noted reputation for climbing, as do other more mountainous states such as Colorado, Utah, California and others, it does have a thriving climbing community that cherishes, respects and cares for what climbable rock we do have. Additionally, the sport of climbing is growing in popularity even in the Midwest, as evidenced by the success and growth of climbing gyms in Kansas City and St Louis. The concerns mentioned in the proposal, such as rock damage and rockfall are by no means unmanageable, nor are they more grave concerns than the risks inherent to other popular outdoor pursuits, such as hunting, horse riding, mountain biking, boating, etc, and I believe public lands should be managed in a such a manner as to afford residents equal opportunity to recreate in public lands. By way of example, there are many parks and public lands in the United States where many different outdoor pursuits including climbing coexist, such as the Garden of the Gods in Colorado Springs, CO, where technical climbing takes place in very close proximity to extremely popular running and walking trails. Finally, the proposed ban on fixed anchors may very well conflict with recent legislation enacted by the NPS concerning fixed anchors in wilderness areas.

In light of these concerns and examples, I urge you to reconsider the proposal to effectively ban climbing in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and to consider working with climbing advocacy groups such as the Access Fund and local climbers to work out a management plan that includes the growing sport of climbing in Missouri's public lands.

Respectfully,

T. Noble

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1232 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 16:45:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

I have to disagree with anything but no action. I have grown up on these rivers and I have to say if anything tourist on canoes litter and cause more damage than any of the locals I know. They throw trash in the rivers, destroy property, and tend to cause arguments with innocent along the way. If any of the problem is the locals I haven't seen it. We volunteer to clean up we don't take more than we give back and we never destroy any of our natural beauty. Plan A and Plan B would destroy my way of life and my families way of life. I strongly urge you to choose no action for not only the sake of me and my families but for all to come as well.

Megan Sechrest.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1233 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 16:55:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please preserve the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in as pristine a way possible while still allowing people to access it. Why allow some use? If people can't access it, they will not care about it. Why keep it as pristine as possible? Because if it is allowed to deteriorate due to overuse (too many people visiting at one time )or misuse (motorboats, ATVs, other motorized use)no one is going to want to visit it anymore.

We can't possibly know what all the potential consequences of various human activities might be, but history suggests we often unwittingly damage a plant, animal, or habitat that later turns out to be important - not only to the plants and animals, but to us humans, as well.

No - to increased canoe/kayak/raft rentals per day by outfitters  
No - to ATVs, trucks, and other motorized vehicles that tear up the environment  
No - to the use of larger motorized boats on the rivers

Yes - to respectful use of the rivers (respectful to the environment and to other visitors)  
Yes - to informed management of animal populations through hunting, fishing, and trapping  
Yes - to assessment and management of plant life to eradicate invasive species when necessary, as well as forest management through dedicated thinning or controlled burns, if appropriate.

The Ozark National Riverways area is a treasure, and it is our responsibility to protect it so that future generations will also be able to enjoy its beauty. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1234 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 16:56:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Restricting the number of non-motorized watercraft at certain landing points in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will harm the economy of local businesses in the area. The livelihood of people is largely depended on tourism.  
Since the biggest majority of the land is owned by the government. This will have a detrimental effect on this area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1235 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 17:05:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Being able to drive onto a gravel bar, make camp, fish all night is a family tradition of my family since I was a little girl. Our whole family have camped on many gravel bars before and since the Ozark National Scenic Riverways took over. Not to be able to continue to do this with my grandchildren will be a terrible loss for them and their offspring. No to be able to see a sunrise or sunset on a gravel bar out on the river will be such a loss for my family as well as for someone whom has never seen it. Traditions are very important part in a person's

life!!

Please allow the tradition of driving onto the gravel bars and camp to keep our family traditions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1236    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 17:09:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I live in New Mexico, but grew up in Missouri. If more backcountry trails were open to bikes in the state, I would be more likely to vacation in MO or even move there. Outdoor access is a big deal to a lot of people, and open space is important for attracting the kind of people you want to live in MO.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1237    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 17:18:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to comment on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan.

The National Park Service, to date, has made a big mess out of our rivers. On the upper Jacks Fork River, at the Highway 17 access point, Buck Hollow, the National Park Service was creating a world class fishing area for the Smallmouth Bass. This was great news. Now the National Park Service released 16 pairs of Otters into the river and they have destroyed all the fishing in the river. This is just another example that the National Park Service doesn't know what it is doing. Now the National Park Service has closed the river access at Buck Hollow and is wanting to close an additional 20 access points in there new Management Plan. They are destroying our rivers.

I strongly recommend that the National Park Service leave our rivers alone and that our state and federal representatives take the No-Action Alternative on the ONSR Draft General Management Plan to prevent unnecessary cost, restrictions and regulations to our public rivers and public lands.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1238    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 17:19:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No further restrictions needed

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1239    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 17:29:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I personally do not believe anything should be done. I am all for the no action plan. I was raised in this area and some of my most fondest of memories are at the river with my family fishing, camping, swimming you name it. I can assure you nobody cares more about their rivers then the people in this community who live here. I have been to the river so many times I cant even count but i can say that their are countless times that i was their and tourists were canoeing, kayaking, floating you name it, and they just dump their trash out all over the river. i cant tell you how many times i have picked up trash from in or around the river because the drunken idiots couldn't do it themselves. i think the problem is that tourists don't respect our rivers. we love them i cant stress that enough. if any bans should be made it should be stricter rules and punishments for littering in our rivers and the area around it. but by passing any three of these you wont be fixing the problem. you will only be making the locals way of life harder and more complicated. if you don't live here then keep out of it. we are the ones who have to see it everyday and enjoy the rivers everyday no matter the season. we are the ones who should have the say so in it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1240    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 17:50:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to state I support the Wilderness Act and support Alt.B

We must take steps to protect the park and river for generations to come. If we don't there will be nothing left for future generations. We must have designated trails and river crossings. I would like to see user limits on ALL user groups to control the amount of pressure put on the land and river at one time. I would be in favor of a user fee if all



the money would be put back into trail maintenance. The bottom line the park service has to in force the laws so the park will always be there to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1241    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 17:54:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for this opportunity to comment. As a frequent visitor to the south-central area of Missouri and an avid trail user I am excited to learn that the Service is planning to update it's use plan. I have read each of the Alternatives and generally agree with the Preferred Alternative B. I would like to put particular emphasis on opening access to Mountain Biking. As a trail-builder of more than ten years experience I know that mountain biking is a very low impact activity. And when allowed on properly built trails in appropriate areas it is a very rewarding way to access and enjoy the backcountry. I enjoy hiking as well and appreciate that not all trails should be open to all types of users so I am not advocating for all access, everywhere. But I sincerely believe that mountain biking can be allowed on most trails and should be allowed wherever possible.

And I will back my words with action; I have invested hundreds of hours of volunteer labor to help create trails in Eastern and South-Central Missouri, I will gladly pour in more when the opportunity arrives!

Thanks again.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1242    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 17:57:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I favor plan B, which seems like a balanced plan.

My biggest concern is the amount of horse manure around the streams and on the gravel bars. The occurrence of this has become more prevalent in recent years. It degrades the natural beauty of the area and I suspect has a detrimental effect on the water quality.

In the past, as I recall, there have been efforts to blame the decrease in water quality on humans. However, based on the collected scientific data, horse manure was the major contributor, if not the only contributor, to this problem.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1243    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 19:27:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As part of a family who have been visiting the Current & Jacks Fork Rivers since the 1950's, I have witnessed the changes that have transformed a hidden, spectacularly pristine natural river way, into a well used recreational highway.

I understand the need for this jewel to be available to all Americans. I regularly avail myself to the foresight of others in Arches, Zion, Bryce, Yellowstone, Glacier, the Smokies, and so many of our other unique National Parks.

Given the Current's soft beauty, it would be a shame if the springs, bluffs, ripples, flowers, glens and all of the spectacular vistas that continue to change with the angles of sunlight and the seasons, could not be preserved to the same extent as our other legacy parks.

I suppose with success, crowding due to popularity is to be expected. This problem simply goes to show how beautiful and valuable these Ozark Rivers are.

I hope that the National Park Service could be given the authority and leeway to manage this treasure to the same degree it does the others. I know of no other organization in Missouri that would have a chance to do this to such a spectacular success.

Stephen Frei 2014-1-27

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1244    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 19:47:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have lived in Carter County, Missouri my entire life, which is 62 years. I'm an avid outdoorsman and enjoy fishing, hunting and boating within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. All of my family (siblings, wife's family children, grandchildren) live in the immediate area as well.

**Comment on the Wilderness Area Designation:**

I am against the proposed designation of the Big Spring Wilderness Area. The designation will not change how that area is currently being managed with the exception that the FIRE division will no longer be able to complete control burns. If the area was ever opened to hunting, the law enforcement rangers would have no methods of patrolling the area for violations, other than foot. The USFS borders the back side of the proposed areas and illegal hunters will access the area by ATV and UTVs. Therefore, legal hunters will have to walk miles to hunt while others will illegally enter through the USFS. How much is it going to cost to manage this new Wilderness Area? Will the government have to hire someone into a new position to oversee it? If so, that's money that could be used to hire maintenance employees to help keep the developed areas maintained. The historic barn would be retained but the plan doesn't state that the barn would be preserved or maintained. Employees would not even be able to drive to the barn with supplies and materials in order to conduct repairs. If the park service didn't plan to preserve the historic barn then that would be a shame.

**Comment on Horsepower Proposed Restrictions:**

I am against the proposed changes to Alternative B regarding HP limits. My suggestions and comments are a combination from Alternative B and C.

Alternate B proposed "no motor" zones on the Upper Current and Upper Jacks Fork Rivers. There are no environmental studies that show impact to these sections of the rivers and there are no documented user conflicts on file. During the summer when canoes and tubes are floating these stretches of the river, the water level is too low for boats to operate. These sections of the rivers self regulate themselves. So what the park is really doing is preventing locals from using the river during the off season, when there is no tourists present. Individuals who live in this immediate area and use the river would not be able to hunt, fish or boat during the off season. It seems the park is attempting to restrict boats from these sections of river with no valid reason or justification. These sections should remain the same as in the No Action Alternative.

The mixed seasonal zones that are on the chart show dates from March 15 - Labor Day as a no motor season. The current seasonal zones are from May 15 - Sept 15. What is the justification for making the no motor season two months shorter? Is there that many tourist floating the river in March and April? I do turkey hunt on the river in April and early May. I don't see many canoes or tubes on the river at that time. Those seasonal dates should remain from May 15 - Sept 15. It's confusing to the public to constantly change regulations. I would keep the same seasonal zones that are already in effect in the No Action Alternative.

The plan proposes for 60/40 HP in the unlimited HP section from Big Spring to Gooseneck (southern park boundary). This is the stretch of the river that I spend almost 80% of my time boating on. I do think that there should be a limit on HP in this section, however, not the 60/40. There should be a section or zone of river open to boat operators who have larger size motors and fish on lakes. A limit of 150 HP would be sufficient. Motors with 300( ) HP have no place on the river of this size. I would be in favor of limiting the HP size to 150.

I am in favor of opening the 1/2 mile stretch of river between Van Buren and Big Spring to the same HP size limit that is implemented below Big Spring. Closing that stretch created numerous parking problems at Big Spring and made it impossible for those who use larger motors in bass tournaments to fish that section of the river. If it was opened, those owning the larger sized motors could launch at Van Buren and motor downstream. This option was proposed in Alternative C.

**Comments on Horse Use:**

I think the Lower Current section of Current River should have at least one designated horse trail for those who live in this immediate area. The middle section has 23 designated trails and it's proposed for the upper section to have 25. I think at least one trail around the Van Buren area would be appropriate and fair.

Thank you for allowing the public to comment. I hope these comments are actually read and park management considers what the majority of the park users (locals) want.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1245    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 20:02:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support alternative C. Not just because I live here but also I believe everybody should have the chance to experience the Current River in the way they feel like doing it within reason of course. Whether by boat, canoe, atv, kayak, horseback or tube. I agree that the Current River is a special area but if we limit the use of too much what is the purpose of having it if you can not access it. I think there needs to be more education on jet boats and more signs about sharing the river to the incoming floaters. I have seen activities from both groups (boaters & floaters) that I do not agree with. But more than once I have had my boat out enjoying the river with my family and been cussed at and harassed by floaters just because we had a boat. I never blow by a floater I wait till I can idle by in the deeper sections and private canoe owners are the worst since they think the boats should not be allowed.

As far as ATV use why don't you charge a fee for a daily use or yearly use permits. Leave most existing trails open do not allow riding on the gravel bars which I agree with except at designated crossings. If someone is being destructive fine them.

I don't agree with the limited use for the area due to we live in a low economical area as it is and since the NPS does not pay local property taxes the tourism does help to offset the effect of lack of taxes. So more limited use would drive down visitors who help support the local economy.

Thank you for the chance to comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1246    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 20:08:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As an avid outdoorsman I have had entirely too many interactions on the Current and Jacks Fork rivers with individuals and groups that seem to regard our Ozark National Scenic Riverways as theme parks, nightclubs, trash dumps or their own property - free to do whatever they want, regardless of how it might effect other people or the environment. Because of these experiences I strongly recommend the National Park Service to implement Alternative A. Please let some aspect of our natural world remain as close to wild as possible!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1247    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 20:11:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family and I have floated both of these rivers since the early 1970's. The rivers and surrounding areas/watersheds need to be protected as much as possible. We avoid going to the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers on summer weekends because of the crowds. We have had to leave gravel bars because of people showing up on loud ATV's and have seen the destruction from ATV's and too many horses crossing the rivers. It's getting harder to find a gravel bar that does not have trail access and tire tracks.

I'm sorry that some of the local residents are upset about restrictions. If they care about the land and its natural resources, it seems they would want it protected too, as much as possible. In the long run, I feel this will benefit them and their area. We have to look at what's best for the larger picture, generations from now. I support more stringent regulations to prevent overuse of the park resources.

Thanks you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1248    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 20:31:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My wife Ellie and I first canoed on the Current River in 1960, and have been on the Current and Jacks Fork many times since, so we have seen the increased usage of the river by other canoeists, and the degradation of its banks and gravel bars those with horses and motor vehicles.

We commend your analysis and effort to come up with alternatives for the future use and regulation of these waterways and their watershed. For those who desire preservation of our natural heritage as we do, Alternative A would be our preferred choice. The closing of illegal roads and the restoration of what those areas were like 50 years ago, and the closing of horse trails beyond what are called for by current plans, along with closing gravel bars to motor vehicles and restricting them to walk-in and canoe-in visitors.

Big Spring should be given wilderness protection, in particular.

We recognize that Alternative B would be a decided improvement from the current guidelines for operation, and would support that, especially with the above parts of Alternative A. Best wishes to those who are trying to satisfy current and future users of the Ozark National Riverway, and we hope little if any of Alternative C will be adopted for the future preservation of these rivers which Ellie and I fought to protect from the dam-builders and make available to those who want to enjoy our Ozark rivers, for decades to come.

Sincerely,

Dick and Ellie Dawson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1249    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 21:08:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to thank the Park Service for their hard work on developing these new plans. I would like to see Alternative A be selected because it will best protect the Park for future generations. It also provides opportunity for visitor to find real solitude.

Thank You

Kevin Olson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1250    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 21:18:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** One of the key recreational opportunities missing in the region are trails for mountain biking. Properly built trails have a lower environmental impact than many existing uses (such as equestrian use). This type of recreation drives tourism, promotes health, and offers a great way for citizens to enjoy their parks. I strongly urge you to take this opportunity to open up the area to mountain biking.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1251    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 22:02:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The current management plan, which was implemented in the late 1980s has adequately protected our waterways without imposing unnecessary regulations on citizens and businesses that use the park. Please do not impose anymore regulations for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1252    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 06:00:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a life-long Missouri resident and outdoor enthusiast. In am in my early 60's, and I have fished, floated, and hunted all over the state of Missouri much of my life. In the most recent decade, I have had the good fortune to have access to the Current River via a private residence that pre-dated the Ozark National Scenic Riverways act. The owner of this cabin has long been a faithful steward of the river and has a multi-generational connection to that area of the Ozarks. In my view, many of the people who populate this part of Missouri have deep roots in individualism and generally cast a suspicious glance any time local, state or federal government seeks to pass legislation of any nature.

Unfortunately, in the past decade I have continued to see a dramatic and relatively unchecked increase in the use and sometimes the abuse of the Current River. As a fisherman, I know that there are many times of the year when attempting to fish the river is futile due to the tremendous volume of floaters. I also know that they have the same right to the river as I do. Even so, I feel that many of those who float the river don't do so because they admire the natural beauty of it, as much as they enjoy a cool river on which to float while they drink, engage in horseplay, leave trash behind them, and use gravel bars as their own personal Johnnie on the Spot. The lower Current can be

downright dangerous to a floater when they end of dodging powercraft.

Despite my personal desire to wish for more stringent restrictions on use and access of the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers, and understand the rancor tightening restrictions would cause. That is why I feel that Alternate B appears to be the more logical compromise, addressing the most pressing issues, while still recognizing the rights of those who want less restrictive access.

At the heart of this issue is the question of "who has the right to decide" on how the land and water is utilized. Since many local residents bristle at the concept of a national government organization "telling them what to do" there is no easy solution. I look, though, to the national parks across the nation. They are our natural heritage. Because of the careful management of these national parks all citizens can experience them in their natural - or almost their natural - state. Citizens don't have the right to wander anywhere they want in Yellowstone; they can't ride horses where ever they please; they can't drive ATV's through pristine trout streams. Why would we treat this national park any differently?

As difficult as it sometimes is for people to see the forest through the trees, now is the time to take a firm stance on offering further regulatory protections of the Ozark National Scenic Riverway so that my grandchildren, and their grandchildren can know the beauty of our state's pristine riverways.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1253	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,28,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** The first thing I want to address is the purpose that the park was put in here in 1964 was for recreation and tourism to help improve the economics of the area. From looking at the numbers of the people we have had since that time in the Alley Springs and Big Springs areas, the numbers have decreased by approximately 40 percent. The federal government has not completed the park as agreed to with Mr. Senter at Owls Bend, nor has it made all the other agreements that it stated it would complete with the other parks. By the enforcement of rules and regulations that the park service has enforced our canoeing and camping has decreased over the last 20 years by a great number.

As far as the boating issue is concerned, your proposed plan will have a detrimental effect on the local boating industry. We have business that build the boats, boat dealerships who have contacts at the local banks to arrange financing for the purchase of their boats, as well as the individuals who do the upholstery for the boats who work out of their homes just to be able to save on rental expenses. Then you have the private individuals who do the graphics for the boats and the polishing of the boats for those who like to keep their boats polished. That is just the boating industry alone. In the summertime, boats are on the river every weekend enjoying what nature provides. The tourist industry impacts every area in this town from gas stations (who rely heavily on the tourist trade) to the restaurants, grocery stores, the t-shirt shop selling souvenir shirts, beauty shops, auto repair places just to name a few. Just the economic impact alone is reason enough not to make any changes.

The river access needs to be left alone. There are many individuals who camp (free of charge), along the river and having the river access nearby for them to launch their boats is a major convenience, especially when you have tourists who need assistance and the boaters are the ones who are able to assist them.

Horsepower-if there is any change at all I would like to see it put into writing that the horsepower is 60/40 so that the jet boats are considered legal. As it stands, the rules show that horsepower is to be measured at the powerhead and not at the jet. There are too many times where the jet boats have had to come to the aid of individuals on the river in situations where time was of the essence and there were no park service individuals around to help. You start regulating even more the horsepower that the boats have and that assistance wont be as timely.

A majority of the residents in this area cannot afford to take vacations, but with the way things are now, they are able to take their family camping at one of the many river accesses at very little expense and that is the only vacation they can afford. Implementing any of your plans will stop them from enjoying what nature and God have provided.

Horseback trails need to be left as they are. Is it really fair to establish 25 miles of trails where our visitors are used to having access to 65 miles of trails? This severely limits our tourists. The horseback riding industry in this town

amounts to approximately 25% of the local tourist trade. You start reducing the amount of trails we have and that is going to create yet another major impact in local economy. With 65 miles of trails, the ecological impact is much less severe than it would be with 25 miles of trails. We need to see more specifics with regard to these trails and the day permits. Only a small percentage of people ride on National Park Service property. For the most part, horseback riding takes place on Pioneer Forest, Conservation land or private property.

During the course of the past year when the Federal government experienced cut-backs, the locals took care of picking up the trash and debris the tourists left behind. Signs were made and hung at some of the primitive camping areas advising the tourists to take their trash with them as the park service was no longer providing trash service. We, as individual taxpayers, own the property. Why should someone who never visits our park or who only visits our parks once a year be allowed to govern our rights? They aren't here to take care of it and during a federal shutdown we weren't even allowed to have access to the property. If I own a portion, I ought to be allowed access regardless of whether or not the government can afford to function. Don't punish us because the federal government can't manage their finances better. You are taking our rights away from us and when it gets down to it, we are the ones who will step up to the plate and take care of it. I firmly believe there should be no action taken on the current management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1254    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 08:19:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I urge the adoption of Alternative A or any other system that genuinely protects these precious finite resources. The attitudes of families residing near the riverbanks are understandable, but these parks belong to all Americans and the proposed regulations do not affect private land. Perhaps phasing in some of the restorations over several years (like the native vegetation to rehab illegal river access roads) might make some of these changes more palatable.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1255    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 08:46:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As citizen, a local, and as a frequent visitor, I support the Preferred Alternative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1256    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 08:47:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I wish I had magical words to put here. How can you tell others that all sources of water need protected. The earth has areas of water too dirty to drink or use. A healthy life can only happen with clean water.

Please protect rivers and all water sources from wrongful use.

June Stevens

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1257    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 08:55:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I read the articles in the Post-Dispatch and I support Alternative A. Free flowing and clean water is becoming harder and harder to find. The nation has decided that it is in the public interest to protect national resources and so the NPS must act in the public interest and protect this rare and precious river system.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1258    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 09:52:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I just wanted to say that there is surely something that can be done that does not take the rights of us locals away. We live here year round, we know the beauty and appreciate it. We don't just come down here for a weekend trip, some of us go to the rivers, etc. several times a week.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1259    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 11:20:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No matter what they say- -some of us local people want to see the river cleaned up and saved. I want Plan B.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1260 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 11:39:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service Administration:

I am writing on behalf of River Bluffs Audubon Society (RBAS) in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National and Scenic Riverways in order to protect the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats and ensure continued public enjoyment and use of the ONSR for both current AND future generations of Americans. While RBAS feels that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, we prefer Alternative B because it:

- â€¢ Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the OSNR;
- â€¢ Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- â€¢ Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- â€¢ Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- â€¢ Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- â€¢ Restores additional historic structures;
- â€¢ Enhances the Riverways' role as an archeological curatorial hub for the region, and
- â€¢ Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

RBAS also wants to emphasize our support for the preservation and restoration of bottomland forests, rather than conversion to pasture for elk, as part of the National Park Service's management activities. The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. The designation of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways by Congress in 1964 served as a template for the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968. The ONSR watershed is at the heart of the largest contiguous block of forest in the lower Midwest, and part of a globally significant Important Bird Area. Cerulean and Swainson's Warblers are numerous along the Riverways, and Bald Eagles also nest in the area. The Riverways' watershed provides critical nesting habitat for many forest-interior songbirds. RBAS is grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

Thank you.

Dan Reed  
President, River Bluffs Audubon Society  
Jefferson City, MO 65109

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1261 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 13:47:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family has been going to the Current River section (Beal Landing (until it washed away in the 80s, and the Log Yard gravel bar) of the park well before it was a National Park (1939), I have been going since 1956 at the age of one. This was the place to go for summer vacations, long weekends etc... We always camp, mostly tents and some pop-up campers. We do not use, or require any type of hook-up and we don't use a generator. Most of the time we camp within a stones throw of the river, 20 to 50 feet, and now do most of our camping in the early spring and fall before or after the summer rush. On a typical fall day we do not see many other people if it is

during the week, on the weekend we do see more traffic, both on the gravel bar and on the river, still not what I would call crowded. We typically have a group of between six to twenty people, and we all camp in a group with as many as seven or eight tent when we have a large group. To break up the gravel bars into individual campsite or to designate specific areas to camp would not be a fun type camping experience, if I want to be told where we can camp I would be more apt to go to a more formalized camping site like the one at Alley Springs. We like the no amenities no frills type of experience. After reading the proposed changes I would have to say that I would lean towards the No Action Alternative. The park service has already discouraged the use of the gravel bars a campsite by eliminating the picnic tables and trash cans, we don't require these amenities because if we don't pack it we don't expect to use it. Our trash is always taken to the dumpster near the outhouse. I would say the outhouse is the only thing required and is used by our group. (Just a note about the facilities (outhouse) it is very well maintained). Our group always leaves the camping area in as good our better condition than when we arrived by policing the area after we are packed up and ready to head home. I am not sure what is really driving the push for change, for the most part we see people that are respectful of the environment and the times that we have seen things that are wrong it is already against the law, driving in the river, four wheelers in the river, loud after quiet time etc... If the present rules can not be enforced why should we make new rules? These new rules would only limit the freedom of the majority.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1262 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 14:37:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I've spent 55 years growing up in Missouri, much time has been enjoyed on the rivers.

Floating, fishing, camping, site seeing have always been fun. After plowing through several hundred pages of dribble, I can only wonder how much cost has been wasted on this planning project.

There are plenty of ecological explanations along the park rivers.....no need for more....there used to be more camp grounds....open them back up!

The locals feel abused and cheated and to some degree I agree, however, since this area has been designated as a nation park, it needs to be preserved as one for everyone. I think comments from one and all should be considered.....boycotting / blocking the meeting areas w/ boats is a poor way to voice local concerns.

The park needs to be managed pretty closely to the way it is now.....the base criteria is the water quality; that's the element which makes it so special! MDC has been working for years monitoring water quality and trying to improve fishing; the floating revenue is likely effected as well by dropping water quality.....I think a prime focus should be to maintain water quality through bank / sand bar protection as much as possible. I support eliminating unauthorized access roads / trails but making sure there are ample horse trails / 4 wheeler opportunities AWAY from the banks.....you select where, but across river banks is a disaster for the river.

The tourism dollars are very important.....It would be great if the over crowded times on the river could be eliminated but I don't see how that can be accomplished. It is what it is, people have different ideas on the ideal float....they can select the time of day / year to float that best meets their need but I would like to see more enforcement patrols. I float regularly and rarely ever see an officer. I don't like having them on the river but too many trashy floaters / fisherman ruin the park.....same applies to giggers. Large areas of the river are destroyed by those that won't follow basic guidelines. The whole river experience is there for everyone.....not just locals, or for those that say "we have a heritage of gigging!"....."it's our land and right". Actaully it's everyones park and nobody has the right to destroy it! This isn't private land, it's a national gold mine and needs to be managed to fullfill the activities of all those that want to enjoy it, as long as the park qualities don't suffer from use.

I wouldn't change much of the current plan except to concentrate on maintaining water quality by limiting bank degradation, limit trash accumulation, & protect the fishery better.....I understand that's easier said than done with the increase in popularity.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1263 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 14:37:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It is quite understandable that those who originally purchased land along Missouri's rivers did so to use the river as a food source and that a number of next generation family members remained with the same thought. Today, with transportation and technology advancements, it is most unfortunate that so many river adjacent land owners feel the water abutting their property is theirs as well as everything in it. All of our rivers and streams are public property and, as such, usable by the public.

However, that being said, it does not entitle either the local land owner or the public visitor to abuse these precious



resources. Most people object to government intervention; but, regretfully, government is the only entity with the power to watch over and protect the public and that which is publicly owned. There are more than enough glaring examples of those who abuse and take advantage of a natural resource when it is left unsupervised; and those who say they should be left to do as they choose are simply not thinking beyond themselves. The Ozark National Scenic River Riverways, like every other natural resource, is not endless in its ability to sustain itself. Therefore, it is the roll of government to establish rules of use in order to assure the public of today, both local and beyond, and the public of tomorrow, both local and beyond, that this publicly owned natural resource will be sufficiently protected to sustain its level of quality.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1264 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 14:46:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I do not agree with any of the alternative plans. I think the NO Action or no new actions- - status quo- - is the right way to go. My family and I have been going to Jacks Fork for over 40 years and I do not feel that any new regulations or obstacles should be put in action. We were at Harvey's Circle B on Jacks Fork River just this past summer and it was beautiful, crystal clear and there were no problems of any kind. There were some people canoeing, some swimming and/or jumping off the tall rocks- -the kids were catching little fish and other wild life then returning them to the water. Didn't see motor boats but it wouldn't have been a big deal if there had been. I don't see a need for more restrictions like not being able to use parts of the rivers for certain things or limiting any or some access to gravel bars. Those gravel bars along the river there that has Harvey's circle B behind them looked great and in good condition even though some pulled their trucks down a little ways on them to unload their rafts, tubes, etc. IN FACT, THE WEEK BEFORE WE WERE THERE THE RIVER FLOODED AND THE GRAVEL WAS ALL WASHED AWAY FROM AROUND THE NICE TREES ON THE GRAVEL BAR AND A LOT OF THE OTHER PARTS OF THE GRAVEL BAR- -THIS WAS MAY/JUNE TIMEFRAME- -HARVEY'S CIRCLE B PAID FOR ALL THE GRAVEL TO BE PUT BACK SO THE TREES WERE SAVED- -THEIR ROOTS WERE COVERED- -AND BY THE TIME WE GOT THERE YOU WOULD HAVE NEVER KNOWN THAT THERE WAS A FLOOD- -THEY PAID FOR EVERYTHING. I think you are doing businesses, property owners, and the visitors a disservice by adding on more rules. Tax payers will certainly have to pay more for any of these new plans- -money we really do not have. We also went to AlleySpring which was exactly as it has always been since we have been going there. Please do not limit businesses, participants, property owners, visitors, etc. from using our rivers, springs, forest, etc. in any additional way.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1265 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 14:54:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I do not agree with any of the alternative plans. I think the NO Action or no new actions- - status quo- - is the right way to go. My family and I have been going to Jacks Fork for over 40 years and I do not feel that any new regulations or obstacles should be put in action. We were at Harvey's Circle B on Jacks Fork River just this past summer and it was beautiful, crystal clear and there were no problems of any kind. There were some people canoeing, some swimming and/or jumping off the tall rocks- -the kids were catching little fish and other wild life then returning them to the water. Didn't see motor boats but it wouldn't have been a big deal if there had been. I don't see a need for more restrictions like not being able to use parts of the rivers for certain things or limiting any or some access to gravel bars. Those gravel bars along the river there that has Harvey's circle B behind them looked great and in good condition even though some pulled their trucks down a little ways on them to unload their rafts, tubes, etc. IN FACT, THE WEEK BEFORE WE WERE THERE THE RIVER FLOODED AND THE GRAVEL WAS ALL WASHED AWAY FROM AROUND THE NICE TREES ON THE GRAVEL BAR AND A LOT OF THE OTHER PARTS OF THE GRAVEL BAR- -THIS WAS MAY/JUNE TIMEFRAME- -HARVEY'S CIRCLE B PAID FOR ALL THE GRAVEL TO BE PUT BACK SO THE TREES WERE SAVED- -THEIR ROOTS WERE COVERED- -AND BY THE TIME WE GOT THERE YOU WOULD HAVE NEVER KNOWN THAT THERE WAS A FLOOD- -THEY PAID FOR EVERYTHING. I think you are doing businesses, property owners, and the visitors a disservice by adding on more rules. Tax payers will certainly have to pay more for any of these new plans- -money we really do not have. We also went to AlleySpring which was exactly as it has always been since we have been going there. Please do not limit businesses, participants, property owners, visitors, etc. from using our rivers, springs, forest, etc. in any additional way.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1266 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 14:55:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family and I have enjoyed our experiences on the Rivers, but have become disturbed by the amount of motorized recreation allowed on the National Scenic River. While we understand that many, perhaps even most, people enjoy a motorized entertainment, (and we do also, at times), there are ample places throughout the country for these activities. There are precious few opportunities, and fewer by the day, for peace and solitude on pristine waters. People wanting motorboats should go the lakes. That's where we motorboat. 4-Wheel toys do not belong in the riverbeds of National Scenic Rivers. Again, there are numerous unregulated creeks in the Ozarks where one can scar the countryside with a 4-wheeler. Besides the visual degradation of the riverbed, consider also the noise impact has on one's day out in the wild.

I would like to see 4 wheelers have their own dedicated area of creekbed somewhere else to desecrate. Motorboats of any horsepower should be restricted to areas below Two Rivers or Big Spring. I was appalled during my last trip to find them running up & down the river near Round Spring. I don't for the life of me see where 4-wheelers and motorboats fit in the mission of the park to (in your own words):

"preserve and protect in an unimpaired condition the unique scenic and natural values, processes, and unspoiled setting derived from the clean, free-flowing Current and Jacks Fork rivers, springs, caves, and their karst origins..."

Nothing in any of the plans seems to, in any way, restrict the right of private property owners to pursue their normal rights. The Private Interests are ruining our nation. I want to strongly appeal to your mission in the Public Interests to not become subservient at the hands of private economic interests and their paid-for political partners. Tourism would not exist (neither would property owners, since their rights would have been submerged under another lake) anywhere near its present-day levels without the creation and preservation of the National Scenic Riverways . The Private Interests should consider that. Property owners along the riverways should be thankful that none of the plans under consideration requires them to upgrade/update their septic systems.

Thank you for your consideration of our input. We know you will endeavor to do the best thing, popular opinion notwithstanding.

Very truly yours,  
Gale Wickell  
Debra Wickell  
Leigh Wickell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1267    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 14:56:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been canoeing the Current River since I was a boy. The trips I used to take with my father, and that I now take with my friends, and that I will hopefully take with my son when he is old enough, are some of the best memories of my life. We are truly lucky to live within a 2.5 hour drive of some of the best scenery and fishing in the country. We typically float anywhere from Baptist Camp down to Powder Mill, camping on gravel bars along the way. In recent years part of our camping chores has been removing the ever-increasing horse manure (this is not from wild horses, as evidenced by the tracks). That's something we never used to have to do. Also, jet boats have become a hazard. I'd say 90% of them charge by us at full speed, seemingly intent on swamping our canoe and gear. A few courteous drivers actually slow, but they are so few and far between I'm actually shocked when I see it. We've also had several instances of ATVs or cars coming up on our remote gravel bar camp on some road not even listed on any map. It all detracts from the experience for us. We go for the solitude, scenery, wildlife, and fishing(catch and release). I know the park and rivers are there for everyone to use, but I don't think the intent of the national park was to make a place for horses to defecate on gravel bars and jet boats to race up and down the river. I applaud any effort to return the rivers to a cleaner, quieter, slower-paced experience for all to enjoy, particularly on the stretches from the headwaters to Two Rivers. Thank you for your time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1268    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 15:10:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I urge you to adopt Alternative A for future management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Alternative A would best preserve the health of these waters.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1269    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 15:54:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I feel alternative B is the right approach to preserve the riverways while allowing recreational use as well. I am certain that all the scenic beauty of the Current and the Jacks Fork Rivers would have been destroyed already if the National Park had not come into existence. We in Van Buren can all look out our doors and see the "Gap" area two miles above and below Van Buren with thousands of tubes every summer weekend along with canoes, kayaks motor boats and even jet skis competing for their own little slice of the river. We try very hard to enjoy the peace and serenity of the river by going above all that or waiting till the multitudes go home. However as more and more people learn of the beauty and new highways provide easier access, the river usage seems to have doubled, every few years. I feel a lot of people have been misinformed by special interest groups looking to capitalize on this natural resource as to exactly what the various General Management Plans entail. The park service has done a poor job of informing people as well. I attended the public meetings in Van Buren and wanted to learn more about the wilderness designation. When I sat down to what I thought to be an informational meeting about the wilderness, I only heard individuals and politicians spewing misinformation about ONSR, the GMP and so on. Not one statement was made by park personnel about the Wilderness plan. It was obvious that I knew much more than most speaking about the topic-The Wilderness Proposal-and those speaking were misinformed about the topic. Alternative B would actually allow for very little change as time goes on whereas if we stay with the no-action plan, things will continue to change more and more as more users have access to more of the river. This world keeps getting larger. No change will have great change just by numbers alone increasing. I stand for PLAN B.  
Diana Blakemore

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1270    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 16:10:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Having grown up around these rivers before they were part of the NP system, I have to say that they are better now than then. That said, they are used past their limit in the summer months. There needs to be fewer canoe rentals, not ATVs near the river, no untended access points. The change has been creeping up for a few years. There are campgrounds that you don't feel safe in, the water is full of algae and murky in places, and the noise and confusion of so many people in canoes takes away the pleasure of going there. I really think there needs to be more control. The more people that visit there per year means more controls must be enforced. At the bigger parks in the west there are signs and more rangers to enforce them. It need to be treated like the other big parks or it won't be worth going to.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1271    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 17:32:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for reviewing my comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan. I agree with premise of preserving and protecting the park.

In line with Ken Burns Documentary on National Parks, the parks success is dependent on the public's ability to access it. The ability to enjoy remote areas of the park may only be obtainable to the elderly or others with impairments (MS) via horse. This is one reason that horseback riding is so popular with the retired folks.

Trail riding continues to increase in popularity with people of all ages. When the number of trails are reduced this adds stress to the existing trails.

I am very concerned when the plan calls for closing 65 miles of trails and only adding 25 miles. It costs next to nothing to close trails but funding for adding additional trails is always at risk.

Horse trails properly designed do not interfere with native vegetation and the natural condition of an area.

For these reasons we need to increase the miles of multi-use trails open to horseback riding. We should not close any trails until there are alternate ones to replace them. As such I would not be opposed to requiring "bridle tags" provided any and all funds were used for those trails exclusively.

Sincerely,  
Richard Stout  
Villa Ridge, MO

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1272    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 18:30:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom this may concern,

I would just like to add my opinion to the proposed changes to the National Scenic Riverways. I would like to fist qualify my comments by saying that I was born and raised around the upper end of current river. I have made use of the river and the land surrounding it in all the ways listed under this plan, from canoe floating the Jack's Fork, to tent camping on the gravel bars, horse back riding along the river banks, as well as Jeep and ATV riding down the various county roads in the area to local camp sites and swimming holes. I am also a boat owner, and spend many weekends on the river currently with family and friends. And look forward to continuing those long running traditions.

With those experiences in mind I must say that I find the current "Alternatives" proposed will not effect the park as expected. While I will contend that the number one reason for spending time on the Current and Jack's Fork river is the peace and beauty of the natural setting, and I would never want to see that natural setting ruined, I will also say that the negative impacts I see on the river will not be fixed given the alternatives proposed. Yes it makes sense that by limiting the usage of the land will protect it, but I must ask who are you protecting it from? The majority of the items mentioned in the plan limit boat, horse, and ATV usage. These are primarily the venues of local citizens. Who better to appreciate the beauty of the natural setting, and take care of the environment then the people who have either grown up, or moved to a location that is surrounded by this wilderness. For those that call themselves "local" this is their home. And who better to take care of their home then the people that live in that home. So in that thought I would ask further why would you limit the homeowners from accessing their own home.

It is my opinion that in most cases it is the usage by individuals who may only visit this park once a year, or once in their lifetime that cause the majority of damage to the park. I have lost count of the number of times I have turned my boat around going up river to pick up a bottle or can floating in the river, many times floating beside a canoe or tube who could have just as easily thrown it away, and in some cases was most likely put there by them in the first place. This is a habit that I learned from watching countless other boaters doing the same thing. Unfortunately these are the events that make the biggest noise, not the boater that picked up the can, but the can in the river. If we move forward with some of the proposed plans, that boater may not be there. This goes along with a lot of the proposed changes, when damage is done to the park by individuals that do not appreciate it to it's fullest, that damage is primarily discovered and in a lot of cases fixed by the very local traffic that these plans aim to decrease or eliminate.

In closing I will give my suggestion for improvement to the park system. It starts by suggesting a NO ACTION plan to continue operating the park as it does now. However, I will add that to improve the park system and conserve it for generations to come the park should include increased enforcement of existing rules and policies regarding littering, and defacing the natural setting.

I thank you for your time.

- Mike

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1273    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 18:46:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I prefer Alternative A. The proposal provides for the elimination of illegal roads and unauthorized horse trails. I float and fish those streams and others in Missouri and would like them to be maintained so that my 5 grandchildren will also be able to enjoy them. Thank you for all you do to protect and preserve our environment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1274 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 19:54:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in favor of no action. I grew up in Eminence, MO. My family and I have spent every moment we can enjoying the Current and Jacksfork rivers. We boat, swim, hike, camp, horseback ride, and genuinely enjoy the beautiful landscape. I now have a family of my own and live a little over an hour away from the rivers, but the distance has not detoured me from enjoying the same activities mentioned above with my own children. I cannot put into words what the thought of my children not being able to enjoy the rivers in the same way that I and my family have for years does to me...it breaks my heart. The NPS has done enough for this area, please take no further action.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1275 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 19:56:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not consider or plan to close horse trails or horse camping. There are many horse enthusiast who enjoy the trails and the recreation it offers. These same horse enthusiast enjoy the river ways, canoing, fishing and hiking, and from my experience leave the trails and campgrounds in better shape than they were found.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1276 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 20:02:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a law abiding citizen, I feel it is my right to have access to these Ozarks riverways. I was raised here and some of my fondest memories growing up were on these riverways. Whether it be from boating to gigging, canoeing to floating, or fishing to swimming. The rivers here are a part of life for us. It's were my father taught me how to fish and swim, and I now how have kids of my own that I want to teach them the same. I want my daughters to grow up and have those memories with me. I want to be able to just wake up and tell my family, "get up were going to spend a day at the river for a BBQ." I do not understand how this can be taken from me. Like I said I'm a law abiding citizen and I follow all laws while on the riverways, so once again how can this be taken away from me. You say your trying to protect the riverways but this initiative in the end will cripple the local economy, and most likely will further destroy its natural beauty. We have local groups that get together and clean our riverways that we love so much. Why would we hurt what we love and care so much about.....we have our rights, who are you to take them from us?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1277 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 20:23:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family and I have heard that the NPS has selected option 2 of the three management plans that have been in review for years. We understand that some compromise is nearly always necessary. We are very happy that option 2 as proposed by the NPS will include a new wilderness trail Current River)and more restrictions in vehicular access in the upper to middle part of the rivers.

In the last twenty years we have found far to many illegal access points on both rivers. We come to these rivers to get away from the rush of the urban environment and not to see 4-wheelers on gravel bars or crossing the rivers.

There are already many Ozark streams with an access at nearly every gravel bar, so we dearly hope the NPS follows through with their plan to ensure that folks like us still have a place to show our kids and grandkids a more undisturbed natural Ozark stream environment.

Jim & Cathy Huckins

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1278    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 23:38:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I grew up in the town of Eminence, Missouri. When you grow up here it is common for people to leave the area in order to make a living, something that we do because we do not want commerce coming in and polluting the area. Then we come home in order to raise our own families in one of the most beautiful areas that their could possible be. With the intention of enjoying the rivers, scenery, wildlife as we and our families have for generations. There have been many areas I could no longer go in because they have been blocked off, places my family has gone for years. Denial of river access, telling people they cannot enjoy boating on the rivers as they have done for years...we care very much about what happens here, we want our families and the generations of families to come to be able to enjoy what we did in the same way. You say you can no longer handle the cost of maintaining which I believe was the agreement, if you cannot return it to the people....

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1279    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 03:02:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Riverways are important for everyone to enjoy. I'm all for conservation. Float trips are an excellent way to get out into nature and see turtles, fish, snakes, birds, and other flora and fauna. I don't own or ride horses and I understand how their fecal materials can interfere with the delicate ecosystem.

In my case, when I float I am very careful to keep all my plastic and cans in the provided mesh trash bags and at the end of the trip, I put all of the recyclable trash back in my cooler and bring it home and recycle. I am a steward of this planet and go above and beyond. There are plenty of locals who get in the river and recover the detritus that other unfortunate floaters lost.

This is a very poor area of our great state and the inhabitants use these rivers to eke out an existence. Restricting access to the river hurts their economy and I'm sure the government wouldn't want to unnecessarily impoverish their citizens.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1280    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 03:31:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe option C will do the most to allow the National Park Service to achieve success in effectively managing the Current and Jacks Fork river resources. My family, friends, and myself have enjoyed visiting these river for more than 30 years. We use both jetboats and paddle canoes and kayaks. Last summer we spent some time jetboating along the stretch from Powder Mill up to round springs. We stopped and helped some canoeists recover their belongings after they swamped their canoe. They were very thankful we were able to use the mechanized advantage of a jet powered boat to Safely help them recover items and help in keeping the river clean by not being forced to abandon items lost when they swamped. This a common occurence all along the rivers of the Many Ozarks. of those opposing motorized boating fail to consider how they would feel if a loved one was in need of medical assistance and possible rescue assistance that could be provided by private individuals in jetboats. Some comment that they wish for peace and quiet and the most disruptive human influences we experienced last summer were due to intoxicated floaters who used foul language within earshot of young children. With the price of fuel these days find that we probably use less gasoline when we take the jetboat because we drive one vehicle to one access point and motor up to an empty gravel bar for the kids to play and stay put for the duration of the day. I was thankful that all of the previously mentioned party made it safely across the slow moving water at Two Rivers without becoming drowning victims. I would like to think these individuals would be more easily monitored and cited if necessary by water patrol and park rangers who have continued access to the rivers using jet boats and that everyone will be able to enjoy these rivers safely as a result.

I believe the environmental impact of jetboat traffic is minor compared the historical changes due to the timber harvest of the late 1800's and the probability of climate change and extreme weather patterns. Gravel bars and shoals will grow and shrink due to flooding events and natural geological influences including the natural process of the ozarks hills eroding, the karst topography including the dissolving limestone beneath and the changing populations of the surrounding forests. These changes could come from invasive species such as the ash borers. Keeping

primitive access points open for access all along the course of the river should help prevent overcrowding problems that could be caused if these areas are closed off. Allowing people to camp on gravel bars could help control the budget costs of trying to establish more space in "developed" campgrounds where the grass has to be mowed and picnic tables maintained, etc. Since these gravel bars appear and disappear naturally changing every year it would be a waste of resources to start trying to label these with signage and documentation. The park visitors get to enjoy a more natural river and sense of solitude by keeping these areas open to camping. At the same time motorized vehicle access to these areas is valuable in providing that same safety net most would will appreciate if an emergency ever arises. These accesses provide a means to escape flash flooding and provide an avenue to provide medical assistance to those in need.

The establishment of a wilderness area at Big Springs which will allow hunting seems to be an effective way to protect the area while at the same time allowing the scientific management of proper carrying capacity of the wildlife populations there.

The only input on the equestrian usage I have to offer at this time is the suggestion to review the possibility of utilizing a longer trail system such as the Ozark trail to help disperse the usage over a wider area.

In closing I would like to thank you for reading my current thoughts on this matter.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1281	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,29,2014 07:05:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	January 29, 2014				
Re: Riverways Draft General Management Plan					

Dear Supt. Black:

Although I gave brief oral comments at the Van Buren open house, I hereby wish to give more substantive input into the Draft Management Alternatives. But let me begin by saying that I found the Van Buren meeting to be a poor forum for expressing input on the obviously controversial proposals. The first two hours, wherein NPS personnel provide information and took input, went fine. But the final hour devoted to discussion of wilderness management in the Big Springs section ended up being a free-for-all anti-government forum that was stifling to anyone who wished to express opinions on the wilderness management proposal. Worse, allowing a politician (Rep. Jason Smith's delegate) to do a 'crowd rousing' speech at the start created a chilling atmosphere for anyone (like me) who wanted to express a divergent view. I will also hasten to add that I live in Reynolds County and I am therefore represented both by Congressman Jason Smith and by State Representative Fitzwater: the former was represented by Darren Lingle, who gave the opening crowd-rousing speech, and the latter was there in person, yet neither acknowledged that they had constituents, such as me, who strongly disagree with their "No Change" attitude. Neither Mr. Smith nor Mr. Fitzwater has actually conducted a legitimate survey and they therefore cannot claim that they know for certain what their constituents desire in terms of Riverways management. I had specifically written to Mr. Fitzwater asking him to acknowledge that not all his constituents agree with his views on Riverways management: that he failed to do so only demonstrates the efforts that were made to give the appearance of a united "local opinion" when in fact there is no unanimity. Further, it was obvious that many if not most of those attending the Van Buren meeting had been actively recruited to attend multiple open houses to give the appearance that their numbers are greater than they actually are: one person attending four meetings is still just one person!

My following comments basically support Alternative B, the NPS preferred Alternative, with a few exceptions which I will clarify.

Re: MOTOR-BOAT FREE ZONES; One of the speakers at Van Buren (Mr. Fitzwater, I believe) said that restricting motor-boats from any sections of the rivers endangers human lives: he obviously is unaware that certain river sections are impassable for motor boats anyways, but mostly he shows his insensitivity to the desires canoeists have for a natural wilderness experience, one which includes being free of motor noises. Would one dare suggest horse-back riders should be accompanied by ATVs because the latter could provide additional safety? Of course not! Anyone canoeing the upper reaches of the Jacks Forks ought to know that motor-boat rescues is not going to happen

and that is part of the charm of being there.

As to the amount of river that should be designated as motor free, Alternative B is good but I am moved to support Alternative A which would restrict motors all the way to Two Rivers on the Current and the Jacks Fork. This is a significant stretch of river and motor-free zoning would be much appreciated by canoeists who form the majority of recreational users on both rivers. With this, I have no objection to 60/40 hp limits.

RE: EQUESTRIAN MANAGEMENT; Alternative B provides for 35 miles of newly designated trails while closing 65 miles of undesignated trails: this is a significant gift to horseback riders, most of who hopefully refrain from participating in riding their horses in the undesignated trails. Those who feel that National Parks entitle them to ride wherever they choose irrespective of the ecological impact will of course be unhappy. My only concern is that large number of horses-upwards of a thousand or more at times-will still be crossing the rivers. The recommendation that riders are given to stop their horse 100 feet from the stream to allow it to defecate and urinate prior to crossing hardly seems sufficient to prevent stream water contamination-shouldn't riders be required to use muck bags if they intend to cross streams? Park Service rules call for burying human waste at least 100 feet from water or trails: why doesn't the same rule apply for horse waste? I suggest as an alternative to muck bags that the Park Service aggressively monitor streams for bacteria: if a danger surfaces, all activity (horseback riding, canoeing, motor boating, etc.) should be prohibited until the waters are again safe.

RE; VEHICULAR ACCESS: Keeping vehicles off of gravel bars makes sense. Missouri State laws ban vehicles from the rivers (except at designated crossings) and in many ways gravel bars are part of the rivers: they often are underwater! Much of the conflict between recreationists is a result of vehicles driving onto the gravel bars and using the bars for making spins, thereby. Vehicles also allow loud music (via car stereos), to say nothing of large containers of alcohol, to be brought onto the gravel bars.

As to road access, it is certainly extremely important that undesignated roads and river crossings be closed and that law enforcement be increased. The ONSR is a National Park, not a national racetrack. Those who argue for keeping open all the current illegal entry points are asking that crime be condoned. I note that Alternative B calls for opening 20 new designated access points: this is more than generous! Those who complain that the NPS are trying to keep the public from entry into the ONSR obviously have not read the Draft Management Plan.

Regarding the proposal to allow mountain biking on some hiking trails, I prefer that this be deleted from all Alternatives. I have no objection to mountain bikes on vehicle roads, but their use on hiking trails is a problem: inevitably, the trails widen and for those hiking it can be difficult to quickly move aside for a fast-moving bicycle. I realize mountain biking is a popular activity elsewhere, but I do not think it is appropriate to encourage it within the Park.

RE: CAVES; In view of the escalating numbers of White Nose Syndrome cases in Missouri, I am glad to see that recreational caving is not being encouraged. Further, caves are a very delicate habitat and deserve the same protection as do archeological sites. Only persons trained in safe caving techniques should be allowed entry, and even that should be made secondary to wildlife protection.

Big Springs Wilderness Management: The proposal for wilderness management of the Big Springs tract is a good idea. I was surprised at the Van Buren meeting by the vociferous objection, but I heard no explanation other than opponents dislike and fear the federal government-that is hardly a rationale but instead a statement of one's mental status. I worked in mental health and I understand that people can get alarmed needlessly by all sorts of things, which seems to be the case here. The Big Springs tract is already managed mostly as wilderness and the only change would be that a few man-made items (the training range and a cesspool) would be removed, and a road already closed to the general public would be closed to Park officials as well. As I understand the proposal, that road could be made into a hiking trail which would encourage greater visitation than is currently happening.

CONCLUSION: In summary, I support Alternative B with a few changes as recommended above. The "No Action Alternative" is really a prescription for continued and escalating problems in the Riverways. The National Park Service recognized the 1984 Plan has long been outdated and they are to be complemented for coming up with reasonable Alternatives in the Draft Management Plan, any of which would be preferable to continuing on with the current host of problems. I hope the discourtesy shown towards the NPS at the Van Buren meeting will not be viewed as a wide-spread sentiment: I truly believe most of us who choose to live in this magnificent area appreciate



what the NPS does to preserve and protect it for we the people and for all the wildlife.

Sincerely,

Susan Hagan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1282    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 07:07:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I've enjoyed the Scenic Riverways for over 45 years as a floater and a camper. There has been a dramatic erosion in the quality of my experiences in recent years on the rivers. This is due to the increase in access roads, four wheeling, and horseback activities. The lack of enforcement by park personnel is evident. The natural resources in the area have suffered as a result.

Please impose more restrictions on the above issues, and enforce them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1283    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 07:58:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family has been enjoying the Jacks Fork River our entire lives. We take several float trips from Alley Springs to Eminence or Two Rivers a year. We value the the time we spend there. We always take extra trash bags to collect not only our trash but any that we find along our way. This has been a valued part of now 4 generations of our family and would be extremely disappointed to see this family tradition come to an end. Please leave access to this beautiful and local treasure as it is for the enjoyment of those like myself and all the other local families whom use it as we do.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1284    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Sample Comments

I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1285    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 08:07:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while

ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1286	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,29,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:**

I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

Thank you for taking time to submit a public comment. Please help us spread the word by sharing this message using the "Share this alert" buttons below.

Sincerely,  
Patricia L. Jones  
7021 Green Tee Ct  
St. Louis, MO 63129

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1287    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 08:08:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

Sincerely,

Don Kurz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1288    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 08:11:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We need to preserve this habitat for future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1289    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 08:18:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Ozark rivers are just my favorite place in the world. My parents took me to camp on the Current River when I was a child. I am now 75, but will never forget all the wonderful canoe trips we made on those rivers over the years. You must do whatever is necessary to prevent them from being further despoiled. Off road vehicles have no place there, and horse traffic must be carefully managed. Please!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1290    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 08:22:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem

features in the ONSR;

- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1291    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 08:23:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I love the beauty of the Ozarks. Please save it for our children and wildlife. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1292    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 08:27:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I feel that public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) should be better managed for wildlife. I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use. Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1293    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 08:30:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please implement Alternative B for better management of the Ozark riverway. I believe this area should be managed for wildlife and wilderness and not for motorized recreation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1294    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 08:34:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). The ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1295    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 08:34:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family has enjoyed swimming and floating on Jacks Fork and Current rivers my entire life (I am 44). We never destroy or damage the river ways. In fact we will clean up the entire area. It would be a shame and unnatural if this is changed. Arkansas advertises as the natural state and Missouri has always been more beautiful than that.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1296    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 08:37:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1297    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 08:42:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Parks Service,

I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;

- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

Thank you,  
Donna Whitehead

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1298    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 08:44:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am very disappointed to hear that our birds are in danger of losing there habitat.My children and I are bird lovers, and have been going to MO. national parks for over 10 years now for a variety of activities....including bird watching! It is inhumane and a disgrace to ruin our natural habitat of the beautiful Ozarks, and I jhope that decision makers will consider the effects it will have on our environment if they lose there homes. Best,  
Carrie Francis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1299    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 08:47:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \*Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1300    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

-----

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1301    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 09:01:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to keep it the way that is now NO Change!!!! Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1302    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 09:05:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1303    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 09:08:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** If memory serves me correctly, the Ozark National Scenic riverway was established to preserve the beautiful Current River and the land and springs in the area. Everyone saw the need to save a river and its beauty from multiple ATM's, horses and a thousand canoists a weekend!!! If the powers that be are not willing to have a plan that saves the river, cuts access way down, limits ATM.s and horses and how many canoes then shame on you for letting a gorgeous river and area be destroyed by thoughtless people who do not understand the river and its environment. My parents knew someone who had a cabin on the Current River and I was lucky enough to grow up on the Current, and later my parents bought the cabin and retired there. My Mom counted canoes that came by and turned in to the Park and welcomed all the rangers who came down the river. So the Current River has a special place in my heart. I hope management will have the courage to do the right thing for the protection of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

There has to be a way that is compatible to all concerned and does not compromise the river itself.

Ruth Conrad Hess

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1304    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 09:18:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Ozark riverways is a valuable resource used by many people not just the local communities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1305    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 09:23:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Rules and regulations should focus on protection of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Riparian zone. Listen to the biologists employed by the National Park Service and not the special interest groups that would seek to weaken any and all regulations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1306    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 09:28:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.



The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kati Guerra

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1307    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 09:30:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is the only planet we have to live on and we need to take care of every inch of it. I believe the animals were here first and it is their planet not ours to ruin. Nature is so beautiful, why are we always trying to change it? Leave the earth as you found it. Help mother nature out, she can't keep up with all these people. Thank you for your time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1308    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 09:31:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am very much in favor of protecting the river and its environs. I would like to see the corridor widened, horses and ATVs forbidden from entering the stream, the number of floaters very restricted, power boats restricted both in the horsepower and the number of boats allowed and any other measure that will protect the river.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1309    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 09:31:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As the Van Buren R-I Superintendent, I am the authorized representative of the Van Buren R-I School District. I am commenting on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan regarding the impact the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and the general management plan has on the Van Buren R-I School District. It is my first responsibility and priority to advocate for the students of the Van Buren R-I School District. Van Buren R-I serves approximately 550 students Preschool-12th grade. The school is the hub of the community. I have analyzed every piece of property within the Van Buren R-I School District boundaries over the last two years in terms of the financial impact the properties have on the school district.

School funding is comprised of three main portions. Federal revenue, state revenue, and local (property tax) revenue. Analysis of property within the district reveals that the Van Buren R-I School District is comprised of approximately 40% privately owned land that is taxed at \$3.43 per \$100 of assessed valuation. The State Conservation Commission owns less than 10% of the land in the district. This land is not taxed at current rates. Instead, the district receives Payment In Lieu of Taxes (State-PILT) for this property. Analyzing the last 10 year trend of this revenue reveals the State Conservation Commission is only providing funding for the school equivalent to 25% of what this land would generate if it were privately owned. The revenue would be 75% higher if it were privately owned. The federal land within the district makes up the remaining 40% of land within district boundaries. This federal land is divided into two entities. The first is the Mark Twain National Forest. The Mark Twain National Forest generates revenue for the school via Federal Payment in Lieu of Taxes (Federal-PILT) through timber sales. The ten year analysis of this revenue reveals that the Mark Twain National Forest only generates 50% of the revenue that private land owners would generate if this land were privately held. The second form of federal property within the Van Buren R-I School District boundaries the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The ONSR generates no revenue for the district in the form of payment in lieu of taxes and there is no timber revenue or other form of PILT activity for this land to support the school. The revenue generated from ONSR land would be significantly more revenue for the district if it were privately owned land.

It is important to note that the ten year analysis was conducted assuming the federal and state property would be assessed at \$1000 per acre and as agricultural land. However, \$1000 per acres is much more than the federal agricultural acreage is assessed currently. So, the calculations are revealing more revenue generated for the school than is actually generated by federal and state property within district boundaries. The Ozark National Scenic

Riverways and Mark Twain National Forest take some of the more valuable land within the school district out of taxation. Upon visiting with the county assessor, and looking at comparable property, it is my belief that \$1000 per acre is a very conservative estimation of the value of the property within the ONSR.

In the 1940-1950's the federal government set aside funding called Federal Impact Aid to assist schools that were impacted by the presence of the military of federal land within district boundaries. This was to help offset the impact of federal presence on schools and other areas of infrastructure within the counties impacted by federal presence. If the Van Buren R-I School District were receiving fully funded Federal Impact Aid, in addition to PILT revenue, this combined revenue would still not equal the amount of revenue generated by this land if it were privately owned. Since 2009, Van Buren R-I Schools have received \$0 in impact aid due to lack of funds at the federal level. Every year, schools impacted by federal presence must lobby Washington D.C. to try to maintain this funding for the schools. Federal Impact Aid has tentatively been approved for fiscal year 2014. However, it is always a fight to try and maintain this funding even if it is not funded adequately. The continuation of PILT payments has also temporarily been authorized at the federal level for fiscal year 2014 but not beyond. Like I stated earlier, even though PILT and Impact Aid have been approved, Van Buren R-I may never see any revenue from these two sources.

I fully understand and support the benefits of the Conservation Commission and the Mark Twain National Forest and Ozark National Scenic Riverways from an educational and conservation/preservation perspective within my district. However, these properties do create a significant financial burden on the school. The school bears additional transportation burdens navigating these lands on roads and gravel roads that are not as well maintained could be should there be more funding available. The school loses out on state revenue each year due to the weather and the inability to get students to school safely due to the roads surrounding and within federal property boundaries.

Further limiting the ability of local businesses such as canoe rentals to generate revenue is also detrimental to the students within the Van Buren R-I School District.

A tax rate of \$3.43 for the Van Buren School District is as high and higher than most districts in the state of Missouri. I am forced to go to the voters again next year with a tax levy extension on the ballot in order to maintain the state established level of funding per student for their education. Because of the lack of jobs in the area mainly due to the presence of federal property, this tax levy extension will be difficult to obtain. I understand the local patrons having difficulty supporting such a tax as the poverty level in our area is among the highest in the state due to the lack of jobs because of the presence of federal property.

I am as frugal with tax dollars as I can be. A salary comparison reveals that Van Buren R-I is among the lowest in the state for staff salaries. I currently have many classes with a teacher student ratio of over 30 to one. This is among the highest ratios in the state. I am holding people accountable for their jobs and making the most cost effective decisions possible with district funds. Should I be unable to obtain a tax extension from the local tax payers, I will be forced to reduce staff, reduce resources, increase class sizes, and further impact my students negatively.

Van Buren R-I is one of twenty-two districts in Missouri impacted by federal property. Two additional districts are impacted by the military in Missouri. I am currently completing my Doctorate in Educational Leadership. The topic of my doctoral dissertation is federal impact aid. I have many sets of data analysis and maps to support my comments. I am only providing a brief overview of the impact of the ONSR on the Van Buren R-I School District within these comments. I welcome anyone to call me and establish a time for me to share this information in more detail.

My request is that the ONSR keep in mind the impact decisions have on kids within the district. I should not have to fight so hard to provide the same education for my students as others in the state provide with little or no fight to maintain funding. I am supportive of the ONSR. I do ask that you please advocate within your proposal to support the funding that should be provided without having to fight for it to support those impacted by federal property. Further, I do ask all who work for ONSR to remember to advocate at the federal level for my students by lobbying congress for consistent, dedicated financial support annually for PILT (although ONSR generates no PILT revenue) and Impact Aid for section 8002 Impact Aid Federal Property Schools. I look forward to working with you to support the ONSR and the Van Buren R-I School District.

Educationally,

Sonia Kuessner  
Van Buren R-I School Superintendent  
573-323-4281 EXT 7  
573-870-1016 (cell)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1310 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a citizen of Missouri and one who very much enjoys our beautiful Ozark waterways, I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR).

I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1311 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 09:36:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a member of Missouri Streamteam #4031, and I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1312 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a native citizen of St. Louis County most of my life, I have been using what is now known as the ONSR since the mid 1960s when it was basically a chain of state parks. I know and love this area and have taught my two children and their families to love them as well. I still visit them a few times a year at my age and photograph the biodiversity.

I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1313 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 09:43:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have submitted my opinion regarding the various plans proposed for the Scenic Rivers, and it was Plan A- -the most protection for the natural resource. I understand that it is important for people to be able to enjoy the outdoors so that they can appreciate the value and beauty of that resource. But if there is widespread degradation of that resource, it will not be available for future generations. Please plan and execute carefully.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1314 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 09:44:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Keep nature natural. Humans have invaded and destroyed enough.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1315 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 09:45:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I visit the black and current rivers and they need protecting as it is a magnificent wilderness for us and the wildlife that I have seen there. Our family has given acreage to the MO Dept. of Conservation along the west fork of the black river and we fought hard to get scenic waterway designation. I use to see vehicles run the waterways and it was devastating to the environment. Thank you for this consideration of a beautiful area. Tanya Irby

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1316 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 09:46:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic

Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1317    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

As one who has floated the Current river, I have see the beauty of this area, even though it has been over 20 years ago. I would like to see this area kept as pristine as possible.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1318    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I was born in Missouri from generations of native residents right here. I'm disturbed that the scenic riverways in Missouri are threatened. The general public is oblivious to the destruction they do to our delicate river ways and we rely on our Park System and the Corp of Engineers to stand strong to protect our national

treasure, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1319    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 10:13:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park, although usage could well be even more limited;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans - and for all the species dependent upon it - and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens and of all species. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant ecosystem.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1320    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 10:32:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic

Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1321    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 10:38:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to comment on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Draft General Management Plan.

Shutting down 20 access points to the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers will have devastating effects on our community and our older folks. This Draft General Management Plan makes no economical sense or plain common sense.

This is another waste of our government money. This Plan sounds like it is part of the United Nations' Agenda 21. Confiscation of private property under the guise of "sustainability." These types of tyrannical gestures are being implemented all around our country. This Plan will seize private property basically on a whim, using "sustainability" as the excuse.

We just went through this all last year with the National Park Service and their "Blueways" Program. The National Park Service has done enough damage to our country giving Yellowstone National Park and other Parks to the United Nations. I'm beginning to wonder just what good the National Park Service is doing!

I strongly recommend that my state and federal representatives support the No-Action Alternative to the Draft General Management Plan and prevent additional confiscation of private property and additional restrictions on our public lands. Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1322    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 10:42:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 1. NFS needs to setup a series of educational meetings with local land owners to help them understand that this resource belongs to everybody and it is in their best interest to further these goals for their own local economy and future health of the rivers.

2. No outboard motors should be allowed to prevent erosion to the banks and safety of other canoers.
3. No ATV's should be allowed in the river or on gravel bars. There should be designated areas for ATV's.
4. No horseback riding in the river or in gravel bars. Designated horseback riding trails should be setup.

5. No overnight camping on gravel bars or sandbars. Designated camping areas should be setup were open fires are safe and fire rings available. A permit system instituted.

6. All trash must be carried out or deposited in available trash containers. Fines should be imposed for littering.

7. Only designated launching areas should be provided.

8. In order to limit the number and frequency of boats on the river at any one time, a permit system should be instituted for groups of five (5) or more canoes. This would reduce congestion at boat ramps and on the river.

9. BWI tickets should be issued to intoxicated individuals on the water. I would not recommend a no alcohol policy on the water, but intoxicated individuals and rowdy behavior should be a cited.

10. Designated stopping areas should be provided for lunch or picnic's with trash receptacles and pit toilets if possible.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1323 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 10:46:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

\* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR; \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources; \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage; \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park; \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill; \* Restores additional historic structures; and \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1324 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 11:00:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to be on record as favoring the Alternative B option for the General Management Plan. I feel that taking "No Action" will result in continued degradation of the Riverways through overuse or inappropriate use. The NPS must stand firm in the protection and preservation of a resource belonging to all Americans and for which the NPS is our guardian.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1325 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 11:01:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Every year I see fewer and fewer song birds. The sky is no longer black with migrating birds in the fall like I remember from my youth. Biologists know about the point of no return in a species where there are not enough breeding pairs to sustain a population. Please, whatever we can do to restore habitats and support endangered populations is worth the funds required.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1326 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208



**Received:** Jan,29,2014 11:17:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please just leave us alone!!!! We can all manage the rivers. Gov. Control has just gone too far

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1327 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 11:25:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

As a resident of the Missouri Ozarks, I hold our rivers and streams near to my heart.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1328 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 11:35:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for your attention to this most important matter. I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

This is one of my favorite areas in my state - Missouri

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1329 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 11:41:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1330 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 11:55:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1331 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 11:59:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I was born and raised in Eminence, Missouri. My entire life I grew up going to the river every day in the summer. My family and friends would go to Bluff Hole, Button Rock, the Eminence City Park and many other places to hang out and swim.

I grew up floating the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers in canoes and tubes. My Dad would and still does take us out in his john boat to fish at Two Rivers and other places. Gigging, during season, is also something I grew up doing and now my son goes out with my Dad and cousins when he is in Eminence visiting.

Many of my family members still live in Eminence. It is the place I will always call my home. I take my children there as much as possible. We spend many hours there in the summer and no trip is complete without going to the river to swim, fish or float. We will also go and visit the many springs, caves, campgrounds and picnic areas throughout the summer season.

The National Scenic Riverways are a vital part of the community and economy for a small little town like Eminence. The beauty of the area is unmatched, God placed his hand on that area and made it what it is today. He also placed it there to be enjoyed by all people whenever they wanted to.

I cannot imagine not being able to access the riverway any time or any where. I understand that they government wants to protect the river, but in doing so, you will be taking away the rights of people like me and my family to visit and enjoy them whenever I am able to come to Eminence.

The Jacks Fork and Current Rivers are so very important to me and my family. Please do not take away our right to use them and enjoy them. God gave them to us ALL.

Thank you and God Bless

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1332	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,29,2014 12:05:33				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please support "Alternative B" for a balanced approach to managing public use while preserving and restoring critical habitat for birds and wildlife.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1333	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,29,2014 12:17:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.				

---

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1334    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 12:17:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I live in the northern edge of the Ozarks. It is too late for the Osage River, but I do not want any further degradation done to my waterways or any other waterways

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1335    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 12:20:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1336    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 12:23:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1337    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 12:29:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1338    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 12:33:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please put reasonable restraints upon activities that have degraded the habitat on Ozark rivers, so that wildlife has a chance to survive and thrive there. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1339    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 12:34:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** SOMETHING must be done to stop the degradation of the park and river. While Alt.A would definitely be the best, I suppose a compromise on Alt.B would be the most advisable and doable. WE must control the erosion from ATV and horse use. After all, this river and park belongs to all of us, not just the hoosiers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1340    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 12:38:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the comment solicitation process you have put in place for this vital issue.

Of the many things that make me proud to be from Missouri, the National Scenic Riverways Park is at the top of the list. I have been floating, hiking, studying and enjoying the extraordinary and rare beauty of this place with my friends, family and students for over 40 years. Anyone who knows these areas realizes that in these rivers, caves, woodlands and riparian areas, we not only have precious state and national level resources, but also, without any exaggeration, world-class natural treasures. While thousands know and love them today, they remain relatively unknown at the national and global frames of reference. 16% o Shannon and Carter County jobs rest on these areas today, but that may one day be a fraction of the economic engine they create. Most of the story of how they will be understood, appreciated and used has yet to be written.

The Grand Canyon, and Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, for example, were once vulnerable and in need of visionary stewardship. Today, places like these have not only entered the national and global consciousness and attracted visitors by the millions, but have enriched their local communities in ways that could not have been

imagined when the far-sighted plans for their protection and development were put in place. When the National Scenic Riverways were established, we took a giant step in that direction. Our current moment of decision for sustaining a balanced, wise and long-term vision for The National Scenic Riverways is every bit as important.

It will not be easy to put plans like these in place. The most important obstacle will be the pressure to yield to short-term, more local demands for plans that allow for increased uses with immediate economic benefit to the area. That is what we find presented in option "C." A fair, objective reading of the plan shows that the increased approaches to development it would allow will magnify the degradation we already see. In addition, the increased use would absolutely require significant increases in staffing, that at a time when staffing levels all already diminished. Personally, I would prefer the more environmentally conservative option "A" because I believe that it is impossible to put an economic and spiritual value on the planet's diminishing wilderness areas. And yet, in every age we have to find a way forward rooted in present demands and circumstances. That is why I support option "B," a plan that attempts a good faith balance between preservation and development. As in ages past, this decision will be made by those who hold the offices of public trust.

They should not listen to the loudest, angriest or even the most powerful voices, but to the voice of the deepest wisdom and judgment they can muster that emerges from reflection on the future as much as the present.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1341    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 12:43:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Ozark National Scenic Riverways needs to be included in a comprehensive plan to protect this significant ecosystem against further degradation from auto roads, horse trails, dirt bike and 4-wheeler paths, mountain biking, illegal logging, motor boating and jet ski use, and overuse. The importance of this area to many species of birds, fish and other wildlife is not even in question, yet the failure of the National Park Service to protect the area from inappropriate use by powerful interests with no environmental protection in place is just plain unacceptable.

Please implement legislation and measures to restore this important and critical natural habitat to a healthy state so that the river can be removed from its current endangered status.

Thank you!  
David Mount

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1342    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 13:02:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our

citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1343    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 13:07:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** For 15 years we owned property at the Lake of the Ozarks, and many of my happiest memories are the time our family spent there enjoying the wilderness and outdoors. Please do everything to insure this beautiful country is protected for generations. I now take my grandkids there and it provides education beyond compare! It is distressing when boats too large for the area, enormous congestion, trash from partygoers, etc, are allowed to pollute this beautiful water. Please protect our wildlife. It is a treasure Missourians should not take for granted. Thank you.

Patricia Balke, PhD

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1344    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 13:09:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1345    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 13:30:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;

- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1346    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 13:37:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1347    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 13:38:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a lifelong Missourian who has floated our Ozark rivers many times, I feel strongly that they are a fragile national treasure that should be protected by all means possible.

I support strong measures to prohibit all motorized vehicles in the vicinity, either on land or water. I also support protections against pollutions, new roads, or any incursions into the unique environment of the riverways.

Thank you very much for your stewardship of this fragile ecology.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1348    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 13:50:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:



- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1349    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 14:03:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a Missouri resident who has canoed both the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers. High motorized access was very distracting and bothersome during my fishing trips. Such unrestricted access will markedly increase erosion and damage these rivers. Jack's Fork and Current River are both beautiful rivers that can be enjoyed by all of us and future generations if we protect them. I strongly support Alternative A as the best option to insure the health of these vital state resources.

I also support full wilderness status for Big Spring.

Sincerely,  
Michael H. Bross

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1350    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a professional ecologist and have often taken middle and high school students, as well as family and friends, on float trips on the Current River and other Missouri rivers. I know it's possible for people to enjoy the river, the waterbirds, the beautiful scenery, and the whole package without being destructive and spoiling for the next person, or for the wildlife, native flora, and water quality found there.

I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas

of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1351    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 14:49:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I very much support the National Park Service providing a high level of protection of natural & cultural resources, with some opportunity for visitors to float, canoe & kayak and ride bikes in the park. I would be somewhat reluctant to see expanded horse trails - as horses destroy trails more than bicycles. I believe some motorcycle trail use would be acceptable as long as they are well muffled (and perhaps limited to less than 900cc machines).

Overall though I wish the rivers would be mostly limited to paddling. Jet boats and jet skis, perhaps, could be limited to a few river sections.

But overall - let the Park Service have overall control to protect and limit this area as the professional staff desires. Also hunting & guns should be extremely limited in the park.

I would have liked to have gone to a public hearing and given the Park Service my support for their oversight & care.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1352    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 14:50:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Help these beautiful animals. They need protected from any harm, torture EVER!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1353    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 14:50:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

Thank you for taking time to submit a public comment.

Sincerely yours,  
Martha Jaegers

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1354    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 15:03:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It looks to me like your Plan B is the best of the offered options. Basically, you couldn't be too restrictive for my tastes. I consider the Current River vastly overused and abused and am adamantly against the use of large outboard motors on the entire river, but especially upper stretches. Bank and bed degradation are too seriously affected to be allowed.

Too many people seem to have no regard for the delicate balance of the river (e.g. macroinvertebrate life and food webs) to understand the need for careful use. More education along those lines would be a wonderful addition.

Abusive use of gravel bars is particularly egregious, too. I was very happy to see that you are going to be closing down many of the old unofficial access points.

If I could have my wishes, I would even like to see access from all points limited to a given number of permit bearers per day much like the system used in the Boundary Waters, but I know that is beyond your capabilities.

Thank you for taking these comments. I just hope that more weight will be given to the ideas of those who come from afar to enjoy the waterways than to those who have money to gain by being willing to abuse them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1355    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 15:27:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to see better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Of the three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

That region is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1356    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 15:31:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please continue to fight the good fight.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1357    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 15:46:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1358    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 15:51:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it: Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;

- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

Sincerely,  
Jenny Meyer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1359    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 15:58:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Proposal A sounds the best. But if Alternative Proposal B is favored because it is a bit more of a compromise then I would support that. The most important thing is to keep our water systems preserved and pristine. I grew up on the Missouri rivers. We had canoes and would go canoeing and inner tubing and have picnic

lunches and go swimming and fishing on the Missouri rivers. Meramac, Big Piney, Little Piney, etc., etc. We ate the fish that my father, who was a fly fisherman(tied his own flies) caught. The best fish I've ever eaten in my life anywhere. We picked up trash on the banks of the rivers, piled the bags into the canoes and took it home with us. This was in the 70's. My daughter just did a project on the Cerulean Warbler for her class at UMC. I adore MO wild life! Saw a new born deer on a walk with my dog in early Fall. I support anything we can do to preserve it!!

Sincerely,

Celia A. Maness

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1360    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 16:05:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep our beautiful Missouri streams free of horse poop. Who knows what damage four-wheelers do to the animals that live and breed in the streams.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1361    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 16:15:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1362    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 16:26:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect sensitive habitat needed for increasingly threatened migratory birds, songbirds, and other wildlife. I treasure this part of the world. I was raised on weekends in the Missouri Ozarks. Please do what you need to do protect the Ozark Scenic Rivers for future generations of people, wildlife, and native plants. Please consider earmarking funds for increased public education on how to be a better user of our shared natural heritage.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1363    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

Thank you for taking time to submit a public comment. Please help us spread the word by sharing this message using the "Share this alert" buttons below.

Sincerely,  
Jacob M. Buchowski, MD, MS

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1364    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 16:43:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1365    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource. Thank you for taking time to submit a public comment. Please help us spread the word by sharing this message using the "Share this alert" buttons below.

Sincerely,

Patricia Hagen, PhD  
Vice President and Executive Director  
Audubon Missouri

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1366    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 17:49:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1367    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 18:05:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while

ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1368    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been moved to write because The Current River and Jacks Fork are treasured by our family. My husband's family has roots in this part of the state.

I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

Thank-you for your time and consideration.  
Mary and Paul Dueren

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1369    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 18:39:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while



ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1370    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 18:53:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I want to express my support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

Also, I feel that the "Alternative B" is the best alternative for best management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I feel that the "Alternative B" would provide the best balance of recreational options while protecting the ONSR and would give best opportunities for public use.

The ONSR is an American gem, and can be for generations. Other "Alternative B" goals, such as restricting vehicles on gravel bars and likewise controlling horse trail use are moves in the right direction, and increasing staffing could go a long way toward protection of the area.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

I give my thanks to the National Park Service for considering better management of the ONSR.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1371    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 18:54:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe that the majority of the local population have a love and respect for our land and natural resources. There are those that disrespect all authority, be it tourist or locals but the majority of us who enjoy and love our rivers and springs do respect the land. We pick up trash left by visitors, we only drive on existing road ways. It makes me sad to see the parks grown up to the point you can only see the spring branches if you are crossing bridges. There used to be paths that led you along the branches that were maintained and you could see the streams clearly, now it looks like a brush thicket.

We enjoy floating, fishing, hiking, hunting and just enjoying nature.

As the NPS continues to block roads and accesses that have been there for decades, damage is done by locals and tourists alike attempting to gain access by driving around barriers. Before they used the roads to access these old camping sites, and river access for private floats. If the roads were maintained people would use them as it is much easier to drive in a road as opposed to driving through brush and thorn thickets. Damage to the land wouldn't happen as frequently if the roads and access points were left open. Again there are always a few who will do damage and act in a disrespectful way but they are not always locals.

Please allow the people who live in the area to have a say in what changes will be implemented instead of allowing special interest groups who have the financial backing to have a greater say because one assumes if someone has the funding they also have more knowledge. The attitude that the locals are not smart enough to care for our land is offensive. If you would listen to the real message behind the anger, the frustration of not being heard or considered when making decisions about our land and resources which affects us on a daily basis sometimes causes us to not express ourselves very well. We love the land. It is or was our heritage to hand down to our children but it was taken from us, for the good of all I suppose or for the majority. If further restrictions are implemented our town's economy will suffer even more. Restrict alcohol and drugs on the rivers. Don't restrict local residents from using our rivers and parks. Some residents of Shannon County actually have an education and are a lot more knowledgeable about nature than the employees from the City who have learned it all from a book. Thank you for reading this.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1372    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 18:55:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). This is something I have advocated for years.

I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

Thank you,

Tony

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1373    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 18:56:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways-located within a globally significant Important Bird Area-provides vital habitat for hundreds of species of birds, including the Cerulean Warbler and the Swainson's Warbler.

Send a public comment to the National Park Service today and urge them to protect this critical habitat.

Take Action &€

Dear John,

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is at the heart of the largest contiguous block of forest in the lower Midwest, and part of a globally significant Important Bird Area. But, decades of rampant proliferation of motor vehicles, motor boats, and horse trails on riverbanks, gravel bars, and throughout the waterways have resulted in erosion, sedimentation, pollution, and overcrowding-leading American Rivers to list the Ozark Riverways among its Ten Most Endangered Rivers in 2011.

Despite this degradation, powerful interests have prevented the National Park Service from improving the management of Riverways. The Park Service is proposing a new plan, and we have the opportunity to restore critical areas of the Riverways' precious ecosystems. Audubon and our coalition partners support "Alternative B" for a balanced approach to managing public use while preserving and restoring critical habitat.1 It's critical that people throughout our state make their voices heard in support of the new plan!

Follow the steps below to submit a public comment directly to the National Park Service. The deadline to comment is February 7.

- 1.Go to the Park Service's comment page (will open in a new window).
- 2.Fill in your contact information.
- 3.Copy the sample letter below and paste it into the "Comments" section. Feel free to edit the comments with your own words about why protecting the Ozark Riverways is important to you.
- 4.IMPORTANT: Let us know you sent a comment. This is the only way we have of knowing how many people are sending letters.

-----  
Sample Comments

I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \*Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

-----  
Thank you for taking time to submit a public comment. Please help us spread the word by sharing this message using the "Share this alert" buttons below.

Sincerely,

Patricia Hagen, PhD  
Vice President and Executive Director  
Audubon Missouri

#### MORE INFORMATION

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1374	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,29,2014 19:15:03
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;

- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;

- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;

- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1375    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 19:18:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** America was founded on common ground. We work best when we play closest to the middle. No plan will ever please everyone, so go with the option that offers something for both sides. Alternative B is a research-based compromise. Please do not select the plan that allows the rivers that belong to all of us to continue to be degraded.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1376    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 19:20:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I love the waterways and expect to help restore them by donating my time so that they are preserved for the future generations. For the environment- fish, air and everything that it contains.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1377    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 19:42:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

-----

I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1378    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 19:56:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** we need to protect our Ozark national scenic riverways

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1379 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 19:57:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource. Thank you for receiving my comments.

Sincerely,

Mike Stoakes

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1380 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 20:19:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1381 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 20:25:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1382 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 20:33:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would prefer Plan B to allow for mountain bike access on designated trails. The Ozark Trail is a multi-use trail and having the possibility to create alternate routes for bikers if the existing Ozark Trail would be deemed to difficult or sensitive to allow for mountain bike traffic.

I believe Plan B will further enhance Missouri's goal of attracting outdoor enthusiasts to the region.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1383 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 20:54:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My vote is for plan A. I would like our rivers to be clean and pristine, not abused like the Meramec River. This is one of the few places left mostly untouched by mankind and I would like to keep it that way for my children and their children to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1384 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 21:29:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may interest:

Obviously, the NPS cannot legislate courteous behavior, so all discussion regarding the hillbillies and city folk are moot. The NPS can legislate to maintain the water and environmental quality within the riverways. If there is accurate, reproducible scientific data that proves the present plan is inadequate in maintaining environmental health, then changes need to be made. Changes are not required because twenty years have passed. The NPS is responsible for protection of the riverways and access by the citizens of our nation. If the access that is presently being exercised is causing irreparable damage, that access needs to be changed. Changes are not required because of lobby. The people of the Ozarks had ancestors that built a culture around the hills and waters. Living in the Ozarks includes smallmouth fishing and camping on gravel bars. Protecting a culture in many ways is as important as protecting the land. Land, rivers, people... all responsibilities of the US government.

Sarah Swindell (4th generation Dent Countian)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1385 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 21:51:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This is a very exciting time for the Ozarks and the Current and Jacks Fork rivers as we have an opportunity to do the right thing and ensure that this area will continue to be protected from development and overuse. I really appreciate the opportunity to comment and thank you for all of the hard work and thought that has been put into developing this management plan. I love spending time in the Ozarks especially the area around the Current and Jacks Fork rivers. It is very unfortunate what the river has become on weekends especially from May-Sept. Something needs to be done about the overuse and degradation of these rivers, as it is not doing anyone or anything any good to be around these rivers during the fore mentioned time frame. I really enjoy spending time canoeing, kayaking, fishing, hunting, bird watching, camping, snorkeling, exploring, and nature observation along these great rivers.

I would like to see a limit on the number of boats that the concessionaires are able to put in on a given day. Limit the number of access points that can be used by these concessionaires on weekends during the busy season. It appears that a regulation like this is already in place on the popular Buffalo River in Arkansas. There is definitely a need to reduce the illegal access trails throughout the park as the amount of gravel and sediment washing into the river is a major concern, for all the animals that live in and around these rivers. I love the idea of turning the area around Big Spring into a Wilderness Area. With these things said I am in support of option A or B, but strongly oppose option C.

Thank you again for this opportunity to comment and I hope that whatever is best for the rivers is the decision that will be made, and we don't let special interest groups affect this special place.

If you have never read the book "Stars Upstream" by Leonard Hall you should as it is a great book about this area and what it used to look like back in the 1930's.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1386 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 22:07:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have canoed the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers on and off for four decades. I've canoe the Meramec, Huzzah, and Courtois many times each year. I've seen what over us end lack of oversight can do to rivers. The rivers of The Ozarks are a precious resource and placing them under national protection was and is a good thing. I have studied the issue and prefer plan B, which I believe will reverse some of the environmental degradation and guarantee the beauty and uniqueness of this region remains for future generations to enjoy, while maintaining its economic vitality so essential for the local economies.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1387 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 04:27:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please save the environment for the birds,,, fur they are the wonder of our world....and Missouri

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1388 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 05:30:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:



- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1389    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 06:28:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1390    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 06:41:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;

- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1391    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 06:42:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
I prefer Alternative B.

My family has enjoyed these waterways for years, and hope to enjoy them for many more. Plan B looks to me to provide the best alternative for securing these precious waterways for my grandchildren's grandchildren to enjoy. While also still providing the public "use" aspect my family has come to enjoy so much.

Thank you

Greg Samuel

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1392    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 07:15:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We are writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). We believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use. Although we feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, we prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current & future generations of all our citizens. Thank you for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

Sincerely,  
Sally and John McDermott

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1393    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 07:33:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1394    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 07:37:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello, my name is Stacy. I FULLY SUPPORT plan A and am adamantly IN FAVOR of the NEWLY DRAFTED GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN. My home is close to the Jacks Fork River near Buck Hollow and Jam Up Cave. I live on the National Scenic Riverways because of its natural treasure and PROTECTED beauty! PLEASE PROTECT THIS GLORIOUS NATURAL WONDER. The horse trail rides leave high levels of E-Coli Bacteria, Stafflocauccus, and other dangerous diseases in the rivers. People who camp, hike, and swim in and near the Ozark National Scenic Riverways do not go there to get sick. People go there because it is a SPECIAL PLACE, a SACRED GROUND. PLEASE keep it that way.

The opposers are GREEDY and SELFISH. They are ONLY concerned with their business or themselves. Those who oppose the management plan want to do whatever they want with no consequences. ETHICS are in order when Natural Ecology is at stake. WE MUST NOT LET THEM DAMAGE AND DESTROY THIS PROTECTED ECOSYSTEM!!! Special places like the Ozarks are disappearing. We cannot let that happen to this National Treasure. People come from all over the country to enjoy our rivers - their rivers. PLEASE KEEP IT NATURAL and SAFE for ALL VISITORS.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1395    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 07:55:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PROTECT.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1396    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 08:14:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is at the heart of the largest contiguous block of forest in the lower Midwest, and part of a globally significant Important Bird Area. But, decades of rampant proliferation of motor vehicles, motor boats, and horse trails on riverbanks, gravel bars, and throughout the waterways have resulted in erosion, sedimentation, pollution, and overcrowding-leading American Rivers to list the Ozark Riverways among its Ten Most Endangered Rivers in 2011.

Despite this degradation, powerful interests have prevented the National Park Service from improving the management of Riverways. The Park Service is proposing a new plan, and we have the opportunity to restore critical areas of the Riverways' precious ecosystems. Audubon and our coalition partners support "Alternative B" for a balanced approach to managing public use while preserving and restoring critical habitat. It's critical that people throughout our state make their voices heard in support of the new plan!

Thank you for your time and consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1397 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 08:32:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I was born and raised with the river as the backdrop to my childhood! Camping, floating, or simple just a visit to the river to skip rocks to pass the afternoon! Albeit that some of the suggestion that have been made in my opinion are spot on, many of them make me wonder what is the true goal of the endeavor. After reading the proposal it seems to me that the State of Missouri and the Federal Government realized that it wasn't profitting from the natural resource enough. Strong regulations will simple hurt the over all atmosphere that is brought on by simply letting nature be nature.

Eminence, MO depends on the river for much of its summer revenue and with these strong regulation that industry will simple dry up and will not exist.

I have seen the river very very low, and I have witnessed it in a severe flood state, but guess what that is nature.

We have laws and regulation right now on the books that are simple not being enforced, what makes anyone believe that new laws and regulations will some how be different, It will not! Alcohol on the river, is a problem, only because there is not a presence of authority to enforce such laws, which im am very sure that there is a law currently that would address this issue. Trash is in the same category, just enforce the current laws. Take the park rangers out of the offices and there trucks and put them on the river banks in high gathering areas, not only does there presence deter, but it would also educate those that have choosen to pertake in a activity on the river!

Motorized boats, now I'm a big support of doing away with this or at the very least minimizing the size of the engine greatly. If we don't someone will get hurt, killed, etc... and there is no requirement to have said engine checked for serviceability which could and does lead to oils and contaminates leaking into the water way.

Nature trails and such, in my opinion there are not enough, but the government doesn't need to be involved, make them apart of the Ozark trail system and let hikers and groups in the area help maintain these trails(Think A.P. Trail). Hiking has become a popular and great activity that requires little to no money to do. A Trail that runs along the river would be great, I for one would love to make that hike!

Campsites, not everyone considers a cleared off piece of land, with electricity and tiolet and showers next to the river camping, many people like my self like to camp very primitive and the impact to the environment is less, no tree need to be removed, no parking lots, no electricity, just nature, that is what the goal is right?

Don't just regulate, make it better for all, a natural resource like we have here is priceless, and shouldn't be a source of revenue for the government, let the people that are effected by the river make the decisions even if its not in the best interest of the government! I realize it takes money to provide park rangers, and trail crews and such, but if you continue to regulate this more and more, less and less people will be there to see what you have tried to save!

Concerned:: J.P.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1398 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 08:48:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep the current river region federally protected. I have canoed and kayaked this river every year for years, beginning before I can remember. If this river became caught up in commercialization, we'd all lose an important and irrecoverable piece of this country.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1399 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 08:57:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1400 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 08:57:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The increase in unofficial road access to the river needs to be stopped.  
ATV use on gravel bars needs to be curtailed.

Horse trails need to be routed away from the water to help with lowering E. coli loads in the water.

Ecotourism is vitally important to this area. If the water quality and river banks/gravel bars continue to deteriorate, this will discourage visitors from coming to the park, and the whole community loses income.

Rules already in place need to be strictly enforced.

Overuse is a problem; people can love a place to death.

I am in favor of Plan A, to protect the river for all citizens to use, and for future generations to still have a truly scenic, natural river to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1401 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 09:03:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It's of vital importance that we begin to do more to protect our natural habitats and lands. The future generations will be proud of the steps we take today to ensure that they will have access to these magnificent places of wonder!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1402 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 09:04:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This is a beautiful scenic area and needs to be kept in that condition!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1403 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 09:08:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** stop animal cruelty.-

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1404    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 09:14:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The very Worst thing we can do to the Ozark Scenic Riverways is to do nothing.

The situation has been getting worse with every passing year.

The option "A" plan is the best, but even that doesn't go far enough.

Getting trucks and ATV's off the gravel-bars makes good sense.

Keeping horse waste out of the water, of course, is a public health issue.

Severe limits on powerboats have been overdue for decades.

They are a danger to canoes, and erode the shoreline to the detriment of fish reproduction.

A total ban on radios and "boom-boxes" should be considered.

That awful noise travels down the river for long distances.

( These days, with so many devises, using earphones shouldn't be a burden. )

Truth be told, the local population has overused this national resource.

They treat some gravel bars like it was their own back yard, or worse.

By the middle of Summer, parts of the Riverways begin to look like Dogpatch.

We've seen locals poach under-sized fish, and bait turkeys with shell-corn.

( You know darn well that the population of wild horses in the Riverways doesn't increase because the local yokels capture the colts and sell them. )

One great way to benefit the Riverways would be to ban the use of minnows or crawdads as bait.

It's probably the best way to stop the local motorboat crowd from poaching.

They zoom to a hole, tie off on a snag, drop minnows straight down, pull out 10 inch Bass, and drive off.

We've seen it, and many others have seen it. It's about time it stopped.

Bass populations, and Goggle-eye populations, are low because the locals Eat Them!

Try an "Artificial's Only" policy for three years and watch the fishing become wonderful again!

It would be difficult to enforce a limit on beer, but it should be considered.

One six pack per adult per float., and No hard liquor at all ... period.

We've seen groups on the water at 10 AM, drunk as skunks, and "yahooing" at the top of their lungs.

Excessive noise, of any kind, should be forbidden, or at least strongly discouraged.

Thanks for your time and attention.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1405    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 09:34:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** For the good of the planet we must do all we can to help!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1406    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 09:41:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My vote for the Ozark National Scenic Riverway is "NO ACTION."

I believe the federal government should not be restricting use of Missouri's waters, and the federal government should not be restricting land and business owners.

Take care of the great National Parks and leave the rest to the states.

S. Hasse

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1407    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 09:43:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The Current and Jacks Fork Scenic Riverways is at risk from the following threats: 1. Unrestricted equestrian activity that leaves the rivers polluted with horse manure and effluent. 2. Unrestricted ATV activity by people who don't respect the rights of others using the rivers. 3. Illegal roads put in, sometimes with the consent and help of local county officials, who think that the rivers are owned by them and who hate everything "federal".

This has got to stop. Unrestrained use of these rivers will destroy the essence of this national treasure. These illegal uses flaunt the very purpose of the scenic rivers designation and is very bad for the biological characteristics of this precious environment.

Please adopt a management plan that protects this treasure.

Jim Fossard

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1408    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 09:51:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have enjoyed the quiet, natural surroundings of the Ozark riverways - by canoe and on foot. Mountain biking on hiking trails would remove some of the peacefulness of this area. In addition, the erosion of the precious topsoil from these trails may lead to degradation of this area. I am myself an avid bicyclist - but keep to the roads rather than the dirt. I hope you will find ways to encourage bicyclists on the roads near and within the riverways area while keeping the hiking trails for those on foot.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1409    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 10:26:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The living systems and habitat of the ONSR should be preserved to the maximum extent possible by limiting access, if at least some portion of the natural world is to be preserved for its true value into the future. With the ongoing rate of extinctions everywhere, the world cannot afford to lose this valuable resource in our lifetimes.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1410    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 10:35:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1411    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 10:41:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My wife and I own 80 acres of timber accessible from the road that goes to Cave Spring on the Current.

Unfortunately today 1-30-2014 is the first I have heard of this proposed change to the Riverway. I agree that this beautiful natural resource could easily be "loved" to death. I have seen some examples of this in Colorado.

Unfortunately I have not seen any maps or read of your intentions as to which roads you intend to close so I can only ask that you not close the access to our property.

Otherwise from the little I have read on this web-site I would support Alternative B.

If possible could you send me by USPS any maps or information that could be helpfull to me in understanding your proposals.

Thank you for your service,

Patrick F Murphy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1412    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 10:50:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:



- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1413    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 11:18:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sirs,

I'm writing you to ask to protect vital habitat for Missouri's Birds.

Thanks for your attention and

Best Regards.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1414    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 11:28:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1415    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 11:33:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect this vital habitat for Missouri's birds.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1416    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 11:45:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1417    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 12:39:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Fully recognizing that preserving or encouraging "biodiversity" is (or should be) a very important emphasis in our country that has so reduced the country's once much more abundant biodiversity, I can only encourage the Park Service to favor your PLAN ALTERNATIVE A.

Obviously, lobbying interest groups and people are favoring more "motorized access". You indicate a difference of 50% nn-motorized (Plan A) to 30% nn-motorized (Plan B). 30% is still a lot of motorized access. The country is already recognizably in the sad health state of "epidemic" obesity/Type II diabetes. We got to this sad state because of following the most comfortable path...and many do not want to "let go".

On "Wilderness Designation" the two plans differ by 26.8% (lan A) and 16.4% (lan B). Even 26.8% is not that large a percentage! 40%..50%..that's a large percentage. Not 26.8%. Again, to increase the much dwindled biodiversity of our nation should be given priority. This is Plan A; not Plan B.

As a fine example and analogy, the Park Service might remember how the State of Oregon put all of its Pacific coastline under protection for the future use of our people...maybe not in "wilderness protective status"...but protected under the correct concept of aiding preservation of biodiversity. Compare it to the Coast line of California and Washington!!

Thank you for listening...

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1418    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**  
I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

Thank you for taking time to submit a public comment. Please help us spread the word by sharing this message using the "Share this alert" buttons below.

Sincerely, IL resident that enjoys MO!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1419	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.				

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

Thank you for taking time to submit a public comment. Please help us spread the word by sharing this message using the "Share this alert" buttons below.

Truly yours

Denis Hoelker

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1420	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 13:26:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I've enjoyed these streams my entire life and am squarely in the camp of Alternative "A". I am the President of the Mill Creek Watershed coalition and our board, members and related constituents feel the same way. I also hunt (turkey)and fish (a lot). With regards to the latter, I'm a member of the Ozark Fly Fishers, Trout Unlimited, The International Federation of Fly Fishers and Project Healing Waters.

As described in the summary, this is what we want:

"Management would emphasize greater opportunities for traditional, non-mechanized forms of recreation and visitor experiences that are quieter, less crowded, and slower paced."

This makes by far the most sense. More development of any kind could get us down a slippery slope. I'm against "B" and "C"

Respectfully submitted

James K Marstiller

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1421 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 13:35:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I grew up in St. Louis Missouri and spend a good deal of my youth on the Current River and in the surrounding Ozark National Scenic Riverways. While I live out of the area now, I am deeply concerned for this place that I know and love. I am also a professional planner (AICP) by trade and am familiar with the process that has been conducted. I know how difficult this project must have been with such divergent viewpoints. My last visit to the Current River a few years back was a good one which involved travelling an 18 mile section of the river by canoe. I was stunned that the river had become so crowded and could see the visible impacts to the landscape resulting from recreational overuse of this resource. While philosophically, I tend to support alternative A, I also understand the concerns of locals and those seeking to recreate in other ways. I feel that the planners involved in the preparation of this EIS have done a sufficient job in balancing these competing interests in the preferred alternative B. Alternative C as well as the no action alternatives are options that I cannot support.

While I would prefer to see implementation of Alternative A, I feel this option doesn't balance all interests in the same way the Alternative B does. I therefore offer my support of the preferred alternative B. Alternative B provides for a wide array of uses without significantly overusing this natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1422 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 13:37:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please support Alternative Plan B for managing the important Ozark riverways to protect our wildlife habitat.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1423 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 13:42:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect birds and animals and their habitat, especially at the oz ark scenic rivers. Many people have worked hard to protect this amazing part of the United States. I will be glad to assist the park service in saving this beautiful areas. We have camped and canoed the for over 50 years before private canoe concessions , horse people and others ready to make a buck for their own personal needs. ATF, private canoeist are forgetting about their footprint. Please tighten the footprint of man to save the area for our children.

Let me know what I can do to help.  
Karen Hoelker

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1424 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 13:44:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It is hard for me to express my concern and love for the Jacks Fork and the Current River. My husband and I have been visiting this beautiful area for forty years. We remember there being quilt demonstrations at the Powder Mill Ferry area and the blacksmith showing off his trade at the old barn on the road to the gravel bar across from Blue Springs. We remember Eminence being quite the little quaint town with a lot of shops to browse in and find local art. We are avid paddlers but appreciate the fact that locals like to socialize on the river in their jet boats. They have always been courteous as we have been to them. A few years back, we had the opportunity to camp at Two Rivers and watch them go up and down the river snagging fish in the dark. Everyone fried up their catch and walked up and down the river sharing food and stories. It was a look back into the past. I don't want to see this go away because of a lot of rules and regulations being imposed on the people whose ancestors settled this area and kept it the way it is for now. I have seen families return to the river once kegs, jello shots and etc were banned from the waterways.

Have you every heard of Gene Goforth? He lived up the hollar where the Jacks and Current come together. He was a famous old-time fiddler and I was fortunate to know him before he passed away. Ask anyone that loves Bluegrass and they will know who he was.

So, I guess I want to say - don't take everything away from the locals. Bring back some of the history for visitors to enjoy. This region is such a gift and I don't want to see the city folks make the decisions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1425    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 13:48:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of Plan B. I grew up near woods and a creek and love the outdoors. I've been on the Current floating for many years and have experienced a decline in enjoyment because of the over crowding and other activies. I hope that the balance between recreational use and good conservation can be restored for both visitors and those who live near the river.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1426    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 14:04:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sirs:

I have been leading weekend backpacking trips into the Big Creek and Brushy Creek valleys for the past 42 years. Big Creek is mostly in Pioneer Forest and is an undeveloped valley, which is accessed by Shannon County Road 250 which runs perpendicular to that creek and is about about six miles north of the Current River where Road 250 crosses Big Creek. The groups I lead are students from John Burroughs High School, which is located in St. Louis. The groups range in size from 7 to 10 high school students. We usually backpack cross country covering about 6 miles per day and spend two or three nights in the Big Creek and Brushy Creek Drainage area. I take groups into this area about three times during each school year in all types of weather. The purpose of these trips is to teach the students self-reliance, basic wilderness camping skills, and to educate them about conservation issues in Missouri.

When I first started leading these backpacking trips into the Big Creek Valley in the early 1970's, the group never encountered anyone, with the exception of a lone walk-in fisherman or a pair of hunters from time to time. Over the decades, the gravel bars started to gained lots of vegetation, which was healthy. But, in the 1990's, I and the students started to see a significant change in the valley itself. On about 70% o our trips into Big Creek, we encountered groups of ATV's (2 to 4 vehicles at a time) driving through the creek and "cutting" tails through the vegetation on the gravel bars. These newly "cut" tails ran from Shannon County Road 250 right down to the confluence of Big Creek and the Current, which is about seven miles of meandering creek. This intrusion of ATV's in Big Creek and its gravel bars has damaged the ecology of the creek and made the area much less "wild" or remote.

The National Park Service is not properly funded by us citizen. But, the Park Service has accomplished a good job of trying to protect the Current River during the past decades even in the face of inadequate funding. I know the NPS has teamed up with some Missouri State agencies to try to police the Roger Pryor Back Country, which includes much of Big Creek and some of the Current. I and my students encourage you to work hard to close all the illegal roads that lead to the Current. Big Creek is a valley worth policing and protecting. ATV's should not be in

Big Creek Valley or on the delightful gravel bar at Big Creek's confluence with the Current. In fact, there are many Shannon County gravel roads already existing on the ridges of Pioneer Forest and near Big Creek and the Current that provide fine places for ATV's to legally operate. Please police and close illegal ATV trails and "roads" leading to the Current River.

Since so many people want to use the area around the Current River, the NPS must establish usage rules, however unpopular, in order to protect this rich, natural, area of Missouri. I support Alternative A, in the management plan. I also realize that I need to work to get Congress to better fund the NPS so it can properly implement its management rules.

I would like to thank the NPS for working so hard to protect the Current River and for allowing me to share my views.

Sincerely,

Eric A. Hanson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1427    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 14:24:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** provides vital habitat for hundreds of species of birds, including the Cerulean Warbler and the Swainson's Warbler.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1428    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 14:47:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep our waterways clean!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1429    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 15:16:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Subject of boat motors - Unlimited motor size can interfere with others enjoyment of the park. No motors is way to extreme in some areas such as below the bridge at Van Buren. Limit the size to 40 HP is sufficient for boaters to get up and down the river without fear of interfering with the floaters, fisherman, etc.

Also, gigging is something that needs to be preserved. Upper river areas where the motors would be taken out, why not allow them only at night? Preserving the rich heritage of gigging in that area.

Subject of horses - Horses are natural to be at the river. Horses by the 1,000's are not. I am not in favor of not allowing any horses. But, I don't have the solution of how to control the overrun during the trail rides.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1430    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 15:23:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My families Heritage along the Current and Jacks Fork River far outdates the takeover by the National Park Service. We have hunted, fished, camped, boated,swam and explored all over the area. We know all the old home places of family and friends, and the cemeteries where these Family Members now rest along both Rivers.  
Over the years we witnessed the increasing influx of people coming to see this area for themselves, either by canoe, Kayak or Horseback. We all share the same wonder in this beautiful stretch of Land. We have seen the population increase from people who visited the area and chose to remain because of the Natural Beauty. We have seen many Businesses boom as a result of the increase in tourism. The economic upswing due to this tourism is apparent from Salem to Van Buren.

When the Riverways were converted from Private to Public Lands our Grandparents were told that it would be managed for all people to enjoy. It seems that the longer it is managed by the NPS, the less accessible it has become. We have lived through many threats to our use of the Land, from the Biosphere to the White River Drainage. Favorite Gravel Bars that have been used by several generations of Families are closed overnight with no notice. Old Roads are closed off. We are being slowly squeezed out of the area, to what end? What benefit is achieved by closing off the Riverways to its visitors and turning it into a Wilderness Area, which appears to be the long term goal of the NPS?

The only option presented in the Draft General Management Plan that my family can support is the No-Action Alternative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1431 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 15:28:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1432 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 15:30:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas

of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1433 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 16:26:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I read the article in the Post. THE Ozark National Riverways are like any other National Park. It does not belong to some one living in Sullivan more than someone in Kansas City or Wyoming. THE Parks are for all of us. The river takes abuse over the weekends with all the drunks. I have floated those rivers since the 60's when I was a teenager sleeping on the sand bars.

Do what you have to do to keep the national treasure for generations to come. It belongs to future National Park users too.

Sincerely,

Marianne Stuart

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1434 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 16:46:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello, I think it is very important to try to preserve rivers and woods as close to their natural state as possible. Therefore, I think that motorized vehicles (ATVs, motorboats, jet boats, etc.) should be prohibited in our national and state parks. Specifically, no motorized equipment should be allowed in the rivers or in the woods. The use of ATVs, cars, etc. causes trails to be cut through the forest, which allows more and more vehicles to drive through the woods. And the use of motorized boats on the rivers damages the rivers. Please forbid these motorized vehicles and boats in national and state parks. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1435 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 16:51:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1436 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 16:58:04



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please resolve this issue.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1437 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 17:01:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Clean water issues.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1438 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 17:14:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The ONSR's location is important to birdlife and is an Audubon Important Bird Area, as well as has special status with the Missouri Conservation Department. We all must do what we can to maintain the quality of our rivers and streams and prevent erosion and pollution. My view is that although plan A would be ideal, the NPS preferred plan B would also be agreeable. My request is that land based motor vehicles be regulated to protect the health of the streambed and the plants. Also, the motorized boating traffic will need to be regulated to protect the safety of non-motorized boaters, and reduce pollution, both noise and chemical. Non official trails should be allowed to return to natural vegetative state. However, you may want to consider some of these unofficial trails as public input into future official trails.

I suggest you develop a policy regarding the non-native plant species, particularly the invasive species like Asian honeysuckle. Over time, the exotics should be removed, and the native species allowed to return, with some native plantings as needed. This activity should take place in all areas of the park: in wilderness, hiking areas, shorelines and also around more people centric areas. St Louis County is partnering with the STL Audubon Society and the MO Dept of Conservation to improve habitat in high priority sites in some County Parks. Hopefully you will seek partnership with interested conservation organizations.

The education focus of the plan is much needed. The younger people in the country are less exposed to nature, and their recreation is more electronic and sedentary. They could grow up, if we're not careful, as voters who do not value wildlife and wild lands.

Thank you for developing the plan alternatives and being careful to involve the public. I am disappointed that I was unable to attend the meeting at Powder Valley because when I got there at 6PM, the parking lot was already full, and my health status did not permit me to walk up from Craigwold road. I do know a person who was able to attend, and she shared with me the paperwork that she obtained. Best wishes for successful implementation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1439 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 18:24:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Despite this degradation, powerful interests have prevented the National Park Service from improving the management of Riverways. The Park Service is proposing a new plan, and we have the opportunity to restore critical areas of the Riverways' precious ecosystems. Audubon and our coalition partners support "Alternative B" for a balanced approach to managing public use while preserving and restoring critical habitat.1

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1440 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 19:18:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;

- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;

- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;

- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1441 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to support better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe it is important to ensure that local citizens as well as visitors have ample access to the ONSR while also ensuring that the Riverways' ecosystems and habitats are protected for this generation and future generations of people, birds and wildlife.

I favor Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and increases opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

I applaud the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1442 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 19:24:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in support of the "no action alternative."

Reasons:

- I am disabled. Walking is difficult. I need to be able to drive onto the gravel bar (Log Yard) to camp.
- Camping on the gravel bar is awesome. Seeing and hearing the river is a large part of the camping experience.
- Every now and then, I have been down on the river when reckless people have disrespected the gravel bar. I always leave the campsite better than I found it. I have even paid a couple of youth to pick-up trash from reckless people. I should not be penalized for the few.
- There are currently rules that are not enforced because of a lack of personnel/finances. How are additional rules going to be enforced?
- All trash cans and picnic tables were removed from the gravel bar. I do not need them to have an awesome camping experience. I use the dumpster for my trash and am greatly appreciative of the outhouse.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1443 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I

prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

Thank you for taking time to submit a public comment. Please help us spread the word by sharing this message using the "Share this alert" buttons below.

Sincerely,

Lisa C. Berger, M.S.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1444    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208    **Private:** Y  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Firstly - - I'd like to keep my email private. Please do not share.

Secondly, I am for Plan A first with Plan B second. Plan C is totally inappropriate for the area.

This link is one reason why I am completely opposed to jet boats on the ONSR:  
<http://www.kayakfishmag.com/news/conviction-of-kid-kayak-angler-killer-nears-appeal/>

Jet boats are inappropriate for the OSNR and they KILL.

Fishing boats are cool. So are horses as long as the horse lovers help with upkeep of the trails they use.

Thank you for your time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1445    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 20:37:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;

- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1446    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 20:38:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Plan A, most restrictive. No engines other than humans should be allowed on the Current above Round Spring and similar on the Jack's Fork!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1447    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 20:48:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to voice my support of the Alternative B plan for OSNR. This plan presents a nice balance between preserving the integrity of the exceptional natural scenery and resources that the Current and Jacks Fork river valleys provide and access by the public to enjoy these wonderful resources. There currently is too much noise and pollution from vehicular/ORV and motor boat traffic and too many undesignated horse trails across both rivers. These unauthorized vehicles and undesignated horse trails severely erode river banks, endangering both natural resources and archaeological resources.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1448    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 20:51:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic River ways (ONSR). I believe that the River ways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undersigned roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1449    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 22:52:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I will start by saying that Option C is unconscionable. The National Park Service should not be in the business of destroying the National Parks. This goes against their mission and should not be considered further. It is appreciated, however, that the study would consider a variety of options.

After looking at Option A and B, I am looking for ways to differentiate the two. It seems that the preferred option (Option B) has a number of positive attributes. I strongly support the wilderness designation status of Big Spring. Option A has even more positive attributes and does a better job of sticking to the National Park Service mission of preserving unimpaired the natural and cultural resources and values of the national park system.

I grew up canoeing on the Current and Jack's Forks rivers and have many fond memories of the peace found there. The thought of cars appearing on the gravel bars disturbs my memory and my view of what those areas can and should be. I understand that there are many ways to enjoy the outdoors and nature, but I think that in this instance Option A does the most for this area to preserve the wilderness and protect the rivers.

Thank you for allowing public comment, but I hope in the end the National Park Service will do what is best for the wilderness and the rivers rather than business or themselves.

Option A is the right choice to achieve that.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1450	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 04:10:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The Ozarks have been exploited with strip mining, proposed "Fracking", polluted water, and more. It is time to professionally research and plan any and all exploitation or potential exploitation of the waterways and wilderness. Large corporations are mining and exploiting the Ozark resources. Any and all research and proposed invasive development for resources and land must include residents and citizens 100% involvement. This country has been raped and pillaged enough.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1451	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 04:40:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.				

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1452	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 04:58:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Sir/Madam,				

I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public

enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of the state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

Sincerely,

Miss Victoria Oakey  
Witney  
Oxfordshire  
OX28 3FP  
England  
United Kingdom

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1453    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 06:57:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am not totally against motors on the current river. What I am against is jet boaters speeding top speed up and down the river. What about "wilderness" includes these, often drunken, speed jockeys putting everyone's life in danger?

When we boat the river we're not afraid of rapids, snakes, animals.....we are afraid that the jet boat coming upriver at 30 mph doesn't see us, or is drunk and distracted.

On a quiet, peaceful morning, when one is enjoying a true nature getting-away-from-it-all experience, you hear the drone far away coming upriver, and immediately know what it is and you wait for it with dread.

A 10 horsepower motor will get you to ANY site on the river you want to go to within an hour, if you select the right access. This is not imposing "restrictions" on anyone, it leaves the river to be enjoyed by the disabled as well as fishermen.

And the argument that they provide safety and "save" people???? Do we have ANY recorded instance of such an event? At best they are saving each other when they collide. Nor do I doubt that someday they will be taking a swimmer or a canoer that THEY have injured. That argument is totally lame.

I implore you to consider 10 hp limit on engines. Can't there be just ONE area where speed is not the primary concern? Can't there be just one area where you can navigate without fearing for your life?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1454    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 07:34:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I think the NPS should take no action on this. It is not the boaters and campers, if you want to clean up the river maybe you should look at all the tubers that float it weekly. I can not even begin to tell you how much trash WE have picked up from them. They are from out of town, they come once a year and they don't care how they leave it. My family loves current river, we love taking the boat and we love camping on gravel bars. We leave everything just as we found it and we enjoy our family time together at our favorite place. YOU should not punish us for doing recreation the right way and cleaning up after the people who don't do it right. You should cut the number of tubers and raft floaters and then if you don't see any improvement then consider alternate routes. But starting off with punishing the locals is WRONG!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1455 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 07:42:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please consider limiting the horse power on our rivers that are in question in this debate. Recreation spots for people wishing to go fast and make loud noise is not very limited in Missouri what with the lakes a rivers already allowing access.

There needs to be places where other recreational users need not fear getting hit by jet skies.

Lets really consider if the jet ski and jet boat users really have the local economy and environment at the core of their desires.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1456 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource. Thank you for taking time to submit a public comment. Please help us spread the word by sharing this message using the "Share this alert" buttons below.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1457 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 08:57:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Plan A would be my choice as having long enjoyed and been restored by the God-given quiet of float trips on Jack's Fork and other rivers, I feel that lakes exist for the speed and noise that man-made motors produce.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1458    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 09:21:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would ask that you please move forward with either plan A or B. A horsepower limit on boats for this river is very important I feel as well. I understand that people would like to use motorized crafts on the rivers and this is fine, but within reason. Nobody needs to go 30 mph and put at risk the safety of those with human powered crafts on such a small stream, especially the upper reaches of these rivers.

I have enjoyed floating down the Current river for years now and would like to continue to do so. Without regulation on motorized crafts however, I'm not sure that I would have the same desire to come visit.

Sincerely,

Raymond Brugger

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1459    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 09:41:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Alternative A presents the most opportunity to bring this jewel of a facility back to a more environmentally positive site. Extreme use has negatively impacted the overall site for too long. It's time to get things back in line.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1460    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 09:50:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPS-

While I currently reside in Idaho, I grew up in Missouri. My first introduction to Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) occurred while I was attending college in Springfield, MO. This very first trip instilled in me a passion and love for nature that I had never before experienced nor to this day forgotten. After college I got a part-time job outside of Ellington, MO and was able to spend much more time in ONSR, become further enriched with each trip. I hope one day to return to this area with my daughter so she can reap the same benefits (or at least have the opportunity to experience them).

This area is truly the crown jewel of the state of Missouri and I believe the most stringent steps should be taken to protect it (i.e. Plan A).

While I understand some of the "local" resentment from those who live closest to the park and would like to do as they wish with impunity, that is not a sustainable path for this "jewel". If the area was not given protection years ago (in 1964), it would be unrecognizable even today. National Parks are for EVERYONE. God isn't making anymore land so do yourself a favor and give this stunning jewel the protection it deserves.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond,

John C. Timpone

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1461    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

\* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem



features in the ONSR;

- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1462    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 10:07:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1463    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 10:09:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Audubon's position on National Park Service management of the Ozark highlands, critical for Cerulean Warblers and many other migratory species. The Ozarks are under assault as never before in their history, due to unprecedented development and growing populations. Please take strong action to assure the habitat there is protected to the extent possible.

Thank you,

Ellen Fennell  
Little Rock, AR

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1464    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 10:35:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic

Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1465	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 10:35:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a wildlife biologist, I strongly believe that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is in urgent need of improved management.				

The Riverways are in danger, and need much stronger protection.

Alternative B should be adopted. It increases opportunities for visitor education and enjoyment, while also providing for crucial restoration of currently abused and degraded areas that should not have ATV access. It importantly promotes science-based ecological protections by enhancing preservation, research and monitoring.

The ONSR is an irreplaceable American treasure. It is one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. Access to and enjoyment of the ONSR is a right of current AND future generations.

Please adopt Alternative B. It is an important step toward much-needed protection of a precious natural area.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1466	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 10:38:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Want plan B for Riverways to help preserve natural habitats of wild birds on the Ozark region,				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1467	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 10:51:10				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.				

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;

- \*Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1468    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom it May Concern:

I have lived in the Ozarks for over 40 years and am appalled to watch the continuing decline of protection for our NATURAL RESOURCES by NPS. I have given 7 months of volunteering to these waterways and over 5,000 volunteer hours beyond that. I have watched and listened to your employees expound that protecting these natural resources is YOUR FIRST RESPONSIBILITY and yet you allow the liberal behavior of destruction to abound in, on and along these waterways for the 'pleasure' of reprehensible and irresponsible citizens - many that are blatantly breaking civil laws. YOU have been given, and have taken on, the responsibility to charter courses that would protect all of our NATURAL RESOURCES for their own health and well-being and for future generations (my children and grandchildren!) to also enjoy RESPONSIBLY!

I am writing in SUPPORT of the BEST MANAGEMENT of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued RESPONSIBLE public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \*Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the MOST BEAUTIFUL and ENVIRONMENTALLY FRAGILE areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1469    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 10:57:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I

prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Gregory Flower

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1470    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The ONSR is a destination for people throughout the Midwest because it includes some of the most beautiful locations in Missouri. I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use. I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR).

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1471    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 11:04:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No comments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1472    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 11:13:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. We need to find ways to both live up to and preserve our name and heritage as "The Natural State". I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1473    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 11:15:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1474    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 11:16:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Protect these natural areas in Arkansas by all means necessary!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1475 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 11:17:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** January 31, 2014

To whom it may concern,

I was raised on Current River until the Park Service FORCED us out! Our house burned in May 1969. It looked a lot better back then but it's all grown up now.

We enjoy our motor boats and canoes. We are on the river all summer long from Akers Ferry down to Round Springs. I am 65 years old I grew up on this river. I cannot ride in a canoe anymore. We pick up trash along the river and help with stranded canoes and assist with first aid if needed.

I attended the meeting in Kirkwood, MO on January 22, 2014. In my opinion, the Sierra Club has no right telling the property owners that pay taxes along or near the river how to live.

Current River is open to the public and welcomes visitors. But visitors need to respect the river and property owners too. Just as if anyone would visit another country and didn't like it then they wouldn't go back. You cannot force the culture to change, so why try to force the culture on Current River or anywhere in AMERICA!

We enjoy our motor boats, fishing, gigging, swimming, floating and sitting on the gravel bar watching canoes float down the river. The Sierra Club is entitled to their opinion and this is mine!

MARY SNYDER  
Property Owner  
Tax Payer  
Family History on Current River  
Tradition

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1476 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 11:18:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1477 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 11:22:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1478 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 11:32:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please support and enact Alternative B because it:

Provides for diversity of use while protecting the fragile ecosystem of the ONSR and reduces ecosystem damage by restoring miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions.

Adding trails permit visitors to see the parks natural resources without damaging them, and permits biologists and others easier access for monitoring and research.

The ONSR is a precious and priceless resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens.

Make sure that our generations legacy is one of preservation of our world for the future, not of destructive exploitation, greed, waste or apathy.

Respectfully  
Regina A Faulkner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1479 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 11:34:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,

My name is Jacob Titus age 24 from Eminence Missouri where I have lived for my entire life.

Over the years I have been around the national parks quite often, worked around and with the park service, and enjoyed many of the recreational opportunities in witch this lovely area has to offer,I do appreciate some things that the NPS has done for the community giving people job opportunities and what not, however I strongly believe that in your efforts to help manage and maintain the Parks you have did more damage than good, I've laid witness to

many different examples of mismanagement in which I speak of but the main and most important thing in the area that has suffered and is considerably noticeable is the condition of the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers, I'm only 24 and I can tell a major difference in the river Condition since the park was established in the are and I know many people older than me that can tell you the same thing, River levels continue to drop every year, the water is still there but its all under the gravel that keeps piling up that nobody is allowed to touch anymore, seems like mismanagement to me.

I own a Jon boat and a canoe in which I truly enjoy using as much as I possibly can, I have many friends and family that also like to enjoy these activities just as we have for years, and hope to be able to continue to enjoy for years to come, I can only speak for the locals when i say that at 99% o people who live near this area that use the rivers for recreational/ personal use love and respect the area religiously, Often picking up trash that doesn't belong to them, and never damaging the environment or leaving anything behind unlike many(not all) of the tourist that seem to treat the area more like a theme park than the beautiful ecosystem that it is.

It is to my understanding that your goal is to downgrade the horsepower size of the Motor Boats or Eliminate the use of Boats completely, well I am hear to say that that would be a huge mistake, not only would this cause a massive disturbance in the community but it would lay refuge to many local businesses that make a lot of there income from boat owners also eventually having a impact on floaters because a good majority of river management management can not be accomplished with out the use of boats, so my proposal is that you simply think hard about what your fixing to do and effect by the actions stated in your new management plan, your liable to do more damage than good.. Again

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1480	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 11:37:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom It May Concern:				

Your offices, indeed all of Watercress National Park, is on land once owned by my family. From the time that the english speaking settlers first started stealing or buying land from the indians, no one has "owned" that land but the Mingo Indians, my family, and the U.S. Government.

You would not have job here if my grandmother, Maxine Hogan, and her sisters Dorothy and Eleanor, had not sold the land back to the Government.

Before her death on January 27, 2002, Maxine told me how much she regretted selling the land back to the government, in order that Watercress National Park could be established. She told me that they sold the land back to the government so that a park could be made here. They wanted the park to be made here so that all the LOCAL people could enjoy the river. They did not sell the land to the government so that it could be mismanage for the benefit of drunks and drug abusing idiots who pee and deficate in the water.

As far as I can tell your plans do not dramatically increase the law enforcement presence on the river.

As far as I can tell your plans do not provide sanitary rest rooms along the river banks so that floaters can have an alternative to peeing in the water.

As far as I can tell your plans do not do enough to dramatically reduce the number of tubers and canoeists on the river nor deal with the trash they leave behind.

As far as I can tell your plans do nothing to stop the flow of alcohol and other drugs on the river, nor the party barges of tubes/canoes tied together for the benefit of the drunks dancing nakid in them.

None of your plans do enough. Throw them away and start over with a committee of local people. LISTEN TO US!!! Maybe then you will get it right....

Robert E. Hillemann Jr.  
Decedent of the Carter Family

---



**Correspondence ID:** 1481 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 11:55:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1482 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 12:18:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Habitat must be maintained for wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1483 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 12:28:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I love our rivers here in eminence. we moved here several years ago partly because of their beauty. I have been coming to eminence since I was a little girl for the cross country trail ride. I have taken my children and now my grand children there. we to the rivers several times a week weather permitting. we enjoy floating, riding our horses, fishing, camping and sometimes just sitting in the water. we take care of our parks and rivers here as they mean a great deal to many of us

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1484 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 12:30:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1485    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 13:03:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;

- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;

- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;

- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;

- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;

- \* Restores additional historic structures; and

- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1486    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 13:04:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe that no changes would be the best form of action. I believe that we do need park service around to control some things, but I do not believe that the locals that do help to keep this area clean should be restricted from the river usage. I do not personally own a boat but I do use one on the river quite often when I get a chance to take my kids fishing and boat riding and I believe that this part of our heritage should remain so that our kids can take their kids out and do the same things. I know people who camp at the jerktail landing quite a bit that have put up signs to get people to help keep it clean. I have also personally helped clean up the area as well. I think that we could try to get people involved in a river clean up every year around labor day. Some would need incentive to do so but I would help out in any way that I could if I were home. I think this would be a good way to create more of a bond between the locals and the park service. Whether you take the clean up into consideration or not we will be trying to do that even if we only get one boat every little bit helps. But if you take the rivers away from us then there will undoubtedly be very few people who would consider attending and helping with something like that and I do not think that the people who floated the river for one weekend would be willing to come clean up the rivers that they cannot see from the city. Thank you for your time and consideration, and I really hope that you can help us locals out that enjoy the river all year round.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1487    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 13:04:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe that no changes would be the best form of action. I believe that we do need park service around to control some things, but I do not believe that the locals that do help to keep this area clean should be restricted from the river usage. I do not personally own a boat but I do use one on the river quite often when I get a chance to take my kids fishing and boat riding and I believe that this part of our heritage should remain so that our kids can take their kids out and do the same things. I know people who camp at the jerktail landing quite a bit that have put up signs to get people to help keep it clean. I have also personally helped clean up the area as well. I think that we could try to get people involved in a river clean up every year around labor day. Some would need incentive to do so but I would help out in any way that I could if I were home. I think this would be a good way to create more of a bond between the locals and the park service. Whether you take the clean up into consideration or not we will be trying to do that even if we only get one boat every little bit helps. But if you take the rivers away from us then there will undoubtedly be very few people who would consider attending and helping with something like that and I do not think that the people who floated the river for one weekend would be willing to come clean up the rivers that they cannot see from the city. Thank you for your time and consideration, and I really hope that you can help us locals out that enjoy the river all year round.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1488    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 13:05:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**  
I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1489 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 13:11:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This shouldn't have to be discussed. Common sense tells you that all wildlife should be here for our children/grandchildren to enjoy. Do what's right.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1490 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 13:34:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1491 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 13:38:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1492    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208    **Private:** Y  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of Plan A. I would lean toward Plan N but the jet boat coalition is out of control, as are the party people. I believe in shared usage but I no longer feel comfortable on these rivers due to the drunken disorderly conduct and the influx of high speed jet boats. ATVs do not need to be able to run on gravel bars or in the river. Yes, I have seen them in the river.

Jet boats do not slow for non motorized boats. I used to take young children in kayaks - I was terrified they would be run over or flip from the extreme wakes.

There is very little land or water left in MO that is not logged, polluted, over run with jet boats, ATVs and drunks. The rules of the National Scenic Waterway rules have NOT been enforced.

There is room for all, but be respectful. Jet boats should be restricted to 10 mph - if allowed at all. Jet boats do not rescue others in need - they cause accidents! Out of state jet boaters come to MO because their behavior is illegal in there states (IL is a prime example).

Drunken disorderly should be fined or in extreme cases arrested. RAFTS should be banned outright. Yes this is an extreme view but rafters are there to party, not enjoy the outdoors. I know rafts can't be banned, but my frustration with the problems on the river has me becoming extreme. I would love to be able to float these streams again, with family, and not have to worry about drunks yelling obscenities, exposing themselves and harassing our group. These rivers have become the go to place for drunken parties - not the intent of a National Scenic Waterway.

I could not get in to the Powder Valley open house - not sure who was responsible for having people turned away. I am quoting from several friends who did attend:

The actions of the jet boat community at the Scenic Riverways open houses demonstrates a need for the NPS to limit their access and size of their motors on the Current and Jack's Fork rivers. They arrived early at the Powder Valley open house with boat trailers and proceeded to park them at a diagonal, some of them taking up 6 parking spots. They then proceeded to shout over comments people were trying to make. When one attendee asked them to explain their sign "Sierra Club drowns people", five jet boaters verbally attacked him. They never explained their sign. Also, one friend was told "they would never listen to someone in a Patagonia jacket." This friend is an avid outdoorsman and conservation minded.

Please preserve our wilderness areas for the future.

Please try to withhold my personal identifying information. I realize this may not be possible.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1493    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of ONSR. I believe the Riverways'fragile ecosystems should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use. From among the reasonable alternatives for better management of ONSR, I select Alternative B because it:

- . Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- . Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features;
- . Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions;
- . Establishes a new visitor learning center and restores historic structures;
- . Strengthens research and monitoring of preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and fragile areas of our state, which should be managed for the enjoyment of current and future generations.

I am grateful to NPS for taking this important step towards better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1494    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 14:03:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Bryler Droste I am a 16 year old junior in my environmental science class and, I am interested in the management of the Ozark National Scenic Rivers because I have recently read about a lot of problems or complaints you guys have had in the last year or two. I believe you should take those into consideration and try to do something about it!

I understand that people take their horses around in the river and like to drink and act crazy but the high population of people and animals in the river can cause a lot of problems. For example let's say I was taking a trip down that down to go fishing because I wanted to try out new fishing spots, the capability of fishing in the areas prior to the activities that go on in the rivers would be very difficult. All of the fish and other living things in the water would migrate to a different area or maybe even a different river. That would make the population go down a lot. I strongly agree that you need to organize your rivers more fashionably. I am not trying to put hatred on the management or business but I have been on many float trips in the Merrimac River and have never once witnessed a problem like yours. Yes there is obsessive drinking and I have seen nudity but that is the only main issue. On the float trips I have been on people respect the people around them and try to be friendly with them. They realize they are on the river to float and enjoy their time, if they see someone trying to fish they are not going to get out of their canoe or raft and go cause problems to that person. Also they have a rule In the Merrimac to where if you're drinking your drinks have to be in a huggie and you must have a bag to throw your trash in, you will very rarely see trash floating around in the river, because they respect their rules.

That is why I think you should improve the rules and management you have on the river, because I enjoy going and hanging out in the rivers on float trips and what not, I am sure a bunch of other people could agree with me on this.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1495    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 14:03:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have read the plan online and am writing in support of ALTERNAYIVE C.

I have fully participated in several management plans on the Buffalo National River and Ozark National Forest so I am speaking from experience and with a longer look at the results of these kinds of alternatives than most have.

I fully support horseback riding and the horse trails. I support more hiking and short trails for birders and historic places. Visitorship at our parks is declining and we need to develop more support for our parks. AS less people use them support for things like funding, creating new parks and acquiring new land wanes. If these parks do not meet the need for recreation just locking them up will only decrease support and lead to more problems with our parks.

Even the alt. b is too restrictive. It will have an impact on visitor use too much. Everyone is not out to canoe, hike or ride and never see another soul out there. That is living in fairy tale land and not realistic during peak times. Sure those who want that experience can make their plans accordingly. They can go to out of the way , less popular places , or off season. I rode on the buffalo recently after an Ice storm. I saw nobody, even in the front country areas.

Finally I am opposed to adding to the wilderness system. Call some piece of land a wilderness area and everyone wants to go there. I feel it has an adverse impact not a positive one. Additionally the management becomes a problem in certain areas. I speak from experience. Ponca wilderness here, got used much more after designation than before. Rescues are difficult and frequent because of the canoe pressure. Trail and repair was almost impossible after the ice storm due to regulations which had to eventually be exceptioned or flaunted, by park personnel.

Please implement alternative C and add nothing or as little as possible to the wilderness. thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1496    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 14:04:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1497    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 14:09:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is isayah burnett I am a 18 year old senior at Alton High School. I feel that if the restrictions of the river are helping the people be safe or limiting what you can and cannot do there is ok. I still can understand why the people who have been fishing there or doing whatever there have the reactions they are having. I would make changes but not as juristic as they made them. The changes I would make is keeping it clean have more trash cans down there hire people that will work to keep it clean. I would limit the hours that you can be there on week days and weekends. All of the changes should be to help the park and to still have people enjoying their self. I think the reason they made the restrictions they did is much for the safety of people and the river. The people who own property there should really be able to do what they want with their property. I really agree to disagree I feel that they should have better restrictions just not some of those outrageous restrictions. At some point people will understand but if the restrictions are stupid like the speed limit of a speed boat it's going to broke. You have to be reasonable to the people if make rules that you know the people won't follow why make a rule. Another thing I disagree on is shutting down the roads. I feel it's going to be and even more jam if there's fewer roads to get there. It's all going to be fine as long as the restrictions stay fair but if there not it's going to be chaos.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1498    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 14:10:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello, my name is Luke Wille. I am a 17 year old, senior from Alton High school. I am interested in the management of the Ozark National Scenic Rivers because my family and I visit park of the Ozarks occasionally. The issues that stand out as important to me are the people that have been living there their whole lives and now have to change the way they live because of some of the new restrictions. Such as a man named Headrick who actually has lived there his whole life. He says "It's nonsense" talking about the new restrictions on motorboats, and roads that him and his whole family have been using since before they can remember. Although in the summer the rivers become crowded, I don't see why that should change so many things. Especially with the people who own property on the river. Most people living there say they want the park to be stripped of federal control and be handed over to the state. Everyone who lives there say they love the river and how it is now. There are three management plans, the first is pretty much saying that nothing changes. The second is some restrictions, such as motorboats and what I have talked about. The third is saying that it's not being used for much at all. In my opinion I think that the second management plan is the best. It's obviously been working for some time now and I don't think you should change something that's not broke. Thank you for your time, and I hope you take my opinion into consideration. Have a good day.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1499    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 14:14:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1500    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 14:15:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support your preferred alternative. I applaud your efforts to allow recreation but in managed ways that preserve the natural conditions in this ecosystem as much as possible. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1501    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 14:20:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I was born in the Current River Valley in the winter of 1956. I've been lucky enough to have lived my entire life within minutes of Current River near Van Buren. My remembrance of how things along the river were before the ONSR first came to town still runs crystal clear.

My life's fondest memories, and some of my earliest, are the family trips to the river. My Dad would load up our family in the station wagon at the end of most summer time workdays. We'd drive to the river and spend the evenings cooling off, playing in the water, fishing and sometimes even having dinner under the shade of a deeply-rooted sycamore.

The people's roots also run deep for many river families along the Current River. Issac Kelley was the first white settler in Carter County and maybe the first Hillbilly in this region of the Ozarks. He was my great, great, great, great, great-grandfather. Issac's love for the river caused him to settle on the riverbank just downstream from Big Springs where he traded with the Cherokee.

I am sure if we could go back in time we would see Isaac, his wife (a native Cherokee), and their family enjoying their hot summer evenings on the edge of the river also.

Since Kelly's first settlement, my family's past and current generations have lived along, played in, have been raised to appreciate, and made their living from the river and its surrounding lands. This is only one of the reasons I have a problem with additional plans to shut off ANY more of the Current River accesses.

With the current plan, it is sad to see there are no access points for family day use unless you are willing and able to walk through a jungle of poisonous snakes and spiders, disease causing ticks, and stingweed to get to the rivers edge. It's nearly impossible for a family with small children, senior citizens, and handicapped to access a riverbank



that is usable for family day use.

You can park your car in a parking lot, put your boat in the river, or pay to rent inner-tubes and party with the tens of thousands of daily floaters. But there is not a place for families to set along the river bank while the children swim and play in the water that's accessible by vehicle. Unless a person has private ownership interest in river land, owns a boat, or stands in line to rent a tube, it's hard to find a place for families to enjoy a day on Current River.

These few generational river-families don't hurt the river, they never have. Rather, they've suffered, nourishing the river back to it's pristine beauty after the big city timber companies raped this land and left out with the money in the early 1900's. Now the ONSR owns and controls it. Preserving the "history" of our culture and heritage is not enough: please, actually help to protect our culture - don't destroy it. Our way of life dies and our generations to come will grow up stunted when you cut down our roots to the river.

My heart aches to think that the grandchildren and great-grandchildren of the local families will not be able to use the river like their ancestors have for many generations. It seems that NO ONE is looking out for the local people's rights to preserve our long standing traditions, our culture, our heritage, for the local folk's river use and way of life. If the roads are closed, this soon to be sr. citizen, and many other families, will be unable to make their way to the riverbanks on Current River.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1502    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 14:24:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Alternative B. I trust the NPS to manage our land to preserve and protect, while letting the most number of users enjoy this land in a way that does the least damage to the natural resources. Limit motorized vehicle use!! Limit horse use!!

I have been enjoying the Missouri Ozark Riverways since my first memories through hiking, canoeing, camping, bird watching and swimming. This land is for everyone, not just for those who live in the immediate area of the riverways. The other rivers of Missouri have already been spoiled by development and overuse (Meramec, Huzzah, Courtois, etc.), let's not spoil the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers, too. Hurry NPS, please step in before it's too late to save these resources! Do not cave to local political pressures. Ozark National Scenic Riverways could be so much more than it is if managed properly. Make this area into a real destination National Park with visitor's centers and other things to do for those wanting to learn more about and enjoy Missouri cultural and natural resources.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1503    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 14:30:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello, my name is Max Sutton. I am a senior at Alton High School and my attention has recently been brought to the subject of the new management plan for the Ozarks River. I am interested in the plan because I enjoy the rivers and all the activities and resources they bring. These rivers create a beautiful area to see and enjoy nature while having fun with family and friends. It would be very depressing to have the experience of the rivers taken away from people because of them being mistreated.

So many families and friends plan on mini vacations and float trips on the rivers that if taken away or highly regulated could really effect the public. I would imagine start of many father and son fishing trips started on the rivers. Those are memories that should be remade year after year. Float trips are a great way to relax and get away for a few days. The Ozark Rivers are definitely a great place for them. I enjoy and I hope that I will be able to enjoy it in years to come. I don't want the rivers to be closed off to the people because of our neglect to care for the water and wilderness around it.

After reading through the management plans I have to say that I agree with plan B the most. I believe it has the best ideas and ways to clean up and care for the areas; along with allowing people like me to enjoy all the resources. I read that petroleum or gas and oil leaks were a problem with the water. Limiting the areas of four wheeling and creating new trails would impact a lot on water quality.

I read that more trails would be made to accommodate the horse riding and that would help clean the water from the feces being put back in the water.

I am looking forward to the advancements of the management plan and hope to be spending summers to come enjoying the water and wilderness. I believe with plan B the water will get cleaned up and people can still enjoy the resources. Thank you for your time have a nice day.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1504    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 14:44:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please take action to protect birds in the beautiful Ozark region, long a haven for many species, who are dependent on our maintaining this critical environmental area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1505    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 14:49:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect the National Park Riverways, home to so many ENDANGERED birds. we have already lost so many. Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1506    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 14:52:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Preserve the area as too much is being depleted as you we'll know!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1507    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 14:56:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My floating experience on these rivers began in 1974.  
It was a lovely and peaceful.

#### NECESSARY RULES:

Whatever plan is adopted must contain the following:

No creation of new roads by ANY PERSON OR ANY VEHICLE other than those planned and created by the park service.

No parking of RV's or camping on unauthorized sites.

No ATV's driven along river beaches or in shallow water.

No shooting of guns or bows along rivers.

NO JET BOATS, HIGH POWERED PROPELLER BOATS, JET SKIS, WAVE RUNNERS, OR SKI-DO'S  
DRIVEN ON PARK RIVERS.

No boom boxes or loud music played within earshot of rivers.

All church based and/or religious baptisms in the riverS by permit only, for limited times, with limits during any one year.

Full complement of park rangers, water, park and trail, to enforce the park's rules and regulations.

#### HORSE TRAILS:

As far as the park's trails are concerned:

Limited horse trails, with adequate foot trails for hikers to get to the same place.

Horse trails are not healthy for hikers to use.

#### POWDER VALLEY PUBLIC MEETING:

The public meeting you recently held at Powder Valley, St. Louis was an uncontrolled disaster.

Why would numerous people with trucks hauling boats on trailers park in Powder Valley's visitor parking lot taking up 8 car spaces or so each on your meeting night?

Was this a plan by those who do not want any park regulations to take up the meeting night parking spaces to prevent others who wanted to attend the meeting?

Certainly all of these trucks had not been boating in this weather to have just come off a river with their boat in tow.

#### EDUCATING LOCAL RESIDENTS:

Locals who live near the designated river park areas need to stop considering these protected areas as an extension of their back yards on which they can do anything.

They are going to have to adjust to the national park rules that protect these fragile environments which are designed in the best interest of the parks and ALL VISITORS, and not just the locals.

Local families who have lived in the area for generations, had ancestors who co-existed with the land and rivers.

It is the present-day local residents who should continue their ancestor's approach to the natural habitat.

When the locals pressure the park service to relax their regulations to the point where the environment is being damaged, the locals need to be directed to other appropriate locations in the state where they can legally carry out their entertainment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1508    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 14:57:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do what you can to help!!

So much depends upon you!!!

Jean in Little Rock

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1509    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 14:59:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Missouri Coalition for the Environment has been doing a stellar job tracking environmental issues for me and others for many years...and I am on board with alternative B for the most part, but I offer some general comments that capture my personal feelings:  
This watershed has been enjoyed by my family- -wife and four children since I moved to Missouri in 1974.(float trips, camping out on river sand bars, fishing etc.) We in Missouri do not have sea coasts, Grand Canyon, Niagara Falls and the like but we have some God given natural treasures of streams and woodlands. I don't know the specifics but I have visited areas in Canada's National Parks( just north of Minnesota)that have been kept in pristine condition...and all who visit seemed to have bought into their vision. My ten year old son and I canoed and camped for a week in the area where no motors were allowed. All campsites were left ship shape, etc. Spectacular beauty...private...quiet and more. The remoteness makes it easier for those areas vs. our Ozarks but we should strive for preservation of the natural beauty. Traffic quotas may have to be part of the program...more advance planning for those wishing to enjoy, but happy when you get the pass...I love horses and riding, but stables, etc should be outside the park and run by private firms...  
Less may be more...Garth F. Fort 314-991-2967

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1510    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 15:18:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1511    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 15:23:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Loss of habitat for birds is loss of habitat for us all. Please help. Bland Currie

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1512    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 15:33:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent:

We are writing to share my comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan (GMP).

We prefer Alternative A as outlined in the Draft General Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement.

Specifically, our experience in the Riverways in the following recreational uses:

We have enjoyed the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, Johnson's Shut Ins for swimming, rafting and camping, hiking.

These uses are important to me because:

they are some of the only pristine environment waterways in Missouri.

In addition, we appreciate the conservation and preservation functions of the National Park because:

the national Parks best preserve and care for the land and water, for future generations..

The primary area(s) we use are:

I have enjoyed the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, Johnson's Shut Ins, Pickle Springs for swimming, rafting and camping, hiking.

The 'No Action' alternative is unacceptable to me because it fails to address the need for more enforcement of existing laws and standards, to better manage overcrowding, and to improve communication and partnership with local landowners and communities. Further, it fails to address these critical problems in the Riverways: pollution, uncontrolled use, abuse of the waterways.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways ('Riverways'), established on August 17, 1964, encompasses 134 miles of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. The Riverways' enabling act has three stated purposes: preservation, conservation, and recreation. As Missouri's largest National Park, it showcases several world-class freshwater springs, caves, and bluffs that are home to fish, birds, rare and endangered native amphibians, crawfish, and plants. It is a testament to Missouri's commitment to conservation that the Riverways is a National Park and was the nation's first National River.

The Current River and Jacks Fork are prime recreational waters in a stunning natural karst area that attracts approximately 1.5 million visitors each year. A 2011 study estimated visitor spending at more than \$55 million with nearly 90 percent of spending from non-local visitors. As a unit of the National Park System, management of the Riverways must ensure protection of the Park's resources in an unimpaired condition for public recreation, education, and scientific value. Among its tasks is sustaining and restoring bio-diversity for the next generation. The management of ONSR-in terms of resource preservation, sustainable use management, and restoration of natural ecosystems-should rival that of our nation's most pristine and unique public lands.

Yours truly,

Janet and Geoff Hamill

425 W. Jackson Rd., Webster Groves, MO 63119

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1513    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 15:42:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and

\* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1514    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 15:43:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I grew up visiting relatives in Shannon County, and I have many fond memories of time spent on the Jacks Fork. I want to see the river maintained in as wild a state as possible. Alternative A seems to do that.

However, one of the common concerns I heard at the public hearing, from people with very different perspectives, was that the National Park Service doesn't seem to have the resources to enforce rules that are already in place or maintain existing facilities. Whichever management plan is adopted, I hope it adds some incentive to allocate more resources to care for this beautiful area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1515    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 15:47:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1516    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 16:08:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect Ozark National Scenic Riverways. It is a safe haven for birds and animals.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1517    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 16:25:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I

prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1518    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 17:19:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect this area to save Ozark birds.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1519    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 17:23:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Plan a is the best to protect the park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1520    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 17:39:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1521    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 17:41:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Additional comments on Big Spring Wilderness

Betty (Becky) Denney  
6410 Arthur Ave  
St. Louis, MO 63139

314-645-3394

Thank you for writing a management plan which balances recreation interests with protection of our national park.

The highest use of the proposed Wilderness area at Big Spring is designation as a wilderness. The description as found in Alternative B is the best option.

I camped and hiked at Big Spring several times each year in 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013 because I love the spring, the trail complex and the views and life along the Current River.

I enjoyed the large old pines and oaks especially within the Big Spring Pines Natural Area and out to the NPS boundary. I own a small tree farm in Reynolds Co and have shortleaf pines and oaks on it. While some of the pines were growing well before 1970 when my family bought the land my pines are not nearly as large and probably not as old as many pines I see in the proposed Big Spring Wilderness area. It is important for our enjoyment and for future generations to keep the 3430 acres primitive and to protect them as a wilderness area. We have very few acres reserved for primitive recreation and this area fits in well with the rest of the facilities at Big Spring.

Also, the wilderness area may become a much needed refuge for our native plants and animals as well as for us.

This living forest and the valleys within the 3430 acres when kept in a primitive state protect a part of the Current River watershed much better than if it were used in some other way or developed with new human structures.

The fire tower and the CCC foundations are human artifacts within that proposed area but have meaning because they represent the care and work of earlier generations for each other and for the forest, the land structure and the soil.

The trees, the hills, rocks, minerals and the soil are the raw materials from which our ancestors built the United States. The very character of our country came from the wilderness that was America. There are very few wilderness areas in Missouri and this is one of the best examples of what Missouri was like before the 20th century.

In this century and in our present culture we must use special planning and scientific knowledge to protect such an area of land with primitive zoning. We should designate the Big Spring area as wilderness and we must protect it.

Thank you  
Betty (Becky) Denney

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1522	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 17:44:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Alternative A is the preferable one.				

There needs to be some primitive areas which are not in Alt. B.

The wildlife, both plants and animals, need a primitive designation- -not just a natural designation, if they are to be saved.

All sections of the river should actually be off limits to all motorized boating, except for rescue boats. How much gasoline, diesel, and/or oil drips, leaks, spills, and runs into the waters of our rivers? Has anyone ever measured it? Does anyone care? The wildlife cannot speak about this, as they can only be poisoned.

No more horse trails are needed. There are horse trails enough for everyone, and if there are not, then there are too

damn many people wantig to horse back ride at the same time. Why not have a quota? It doesn't make sense to invite those huge shitting machines into the park and then wonder why E. coli has been confirmed in large numbers downstream. Who in their right mind would drink from the river, as the Natives used to do? Remember, they were able to drink from the rivers because we humans were not trashing the waterways as we allow today.

ATV's are so destructive as to merit special attention. We own an ATV for farm use and I can attest to their extreme destructiveness. The riders rarely stay on the trails, the tires create deep trenches in a very short time, the machines run over turtles, snakes, and who knows what. They have no place in a park where people (and animals) go for peace and quiet. Have you even been listening to a bird call only to have the sound drowned out by some buffoon and his miniature bulldozer? Well, I have, and more. ATV riders from Sutton's Bluff left the trails (their modus operendi) and they trashed our strawberry bed. I say ban ATV's from all parks, except paved roads which, incidentally, is where motorized vehicles belong. Sorry for any misspellings.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1523    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 18:10:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1524    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 18:36:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;



- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1525    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 18:36:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I, Brian Kolde, fully support Alternative A, providing generally the maximum resource protection and wilderness designation possible. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways system and its complex karst catchment area is a local, national and world treasure. If there is one river system in America to keep in a pristine, primitive state, this is it. The amazing springs, underground lakes, flora, fauna in the rivers and on the lands surrounding them are unique and extremely delicate. I have utilized the Ozark National Scenic Riverways area for quiet recreation since a child in the late 1960s. Its haunting beauty and serenity has stayed with me my entire life. However, I am very concerned about increasing overuse and abuse of the river system and its surrounding lands over time. I see more water pollution, litter, vehicle damage, motor noise and human obnoxious behavior. There are plenty of other, less sensitive water recreation opportunities all over Missouri where heavier use can occur with less harm. I support closing the most number of roads, limiting the most horse access, limiting the most vehicle/ATV activity, limiting the most areas for motorized boats, limiting engine size and noise, protecting the most shorelines and gravel bars, and designating the most wilderness areas. I do not believe increasing protections and regulations will harm the local economy or inhibit local traditional uses- - it will in fact increase tourism in local communities by responsible visitors from near and far. This is a National Park Service-managed area for a good reason. All management tools available should be utilized to protect the resources and provide for quiet, respectful recreation, while preserving the natural, archaeological and historic treasures unique to ONSR. I fully support Alternative A and the designation of the entire Big Spring Wilderness Study Area as formal wilderness. Missouri has not had substantial wilderness designations in decades. Only a tiny percentage of the state is protected in this way. This small amount of land designated will harm no person or any person's way of life. It will enhance it. Missouri is very behind other states in wilderness designations, so this is sorely needed now. Please note that I attended a public open house and hearing, listening carefully and respectfully to all opinions expressed. Thank you for taking my comments and for the great work managing the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for current and future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1526    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 19:06:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** SAMPLE COMMENTS

I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1527    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 19:46:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** please vote for alternative A. it would protect our precious riverways here in mo. they are the closest thing to heaven i have seen and do not need to become exhausted from all of man's needs to dominate. leave some wild lands for our country's future generations to dream and be proud of. please do it while there is still time. thank you, brad burgess rn icu nurse centerpoint hospital, independence mo 64055

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1528    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 19:50:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,

During my youth, my family made routine visits to the Current river every year. Now 40 years old, I bring my family to the river a couple times each year, while I personally visit several times in addition to that during all months of the year.

I am in favor of plan B that has been put forth.

Over the years I've floated, and kayaked all parts of the Current river and Jacks Fork. I do not go beyond Round Spring anymore on the Current River. The largest reason for that is because of jet boats. I've witnessed motorboats weaving in and out of tubers withing feet of them closer to Van Buren, I've been in narrow chutes and have had motor boats coming upstream force me to take evasive action. And I've had boats come at me close enough I could of touched them with my paddle as they gunned the motor and laughed.

One of these incidents scared my wife and she will not float in the river where boats are active. There is plenty of river accessible to motor boats to enjoy. The upper Current and Jacks Fork should be allowed to be peacefully enjoyed by non-motor boats and by tubers. Restrictions will allow RESPONSIBLE boat owners access and usage and deter the rowdy boaters, leaving them to use the lower portions of the river.

I'm also in favor of the new plan because of increasing trash and misuse I've witnessed while enjoying the park. I've spent way too much time collecting trash on my floats. Some of this is from rental canoe users but I've seen many an ATV "party" set up river side.

I do believe that all users should have some access to the park, but unrestricted usage leads to damage and decay. Plan B is a great compromise that allows all parties to gain benefits even if some restrictions apply. Not doing anything greatly increases the chance our park will become another degraded landscape like the many of our unregulated rivers in the state of Missouri.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1529    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 20:39:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to comment on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Draft General Management Plan.

The Federal Park Service is killing us older folks. They are closing our river access points, they are killing the fish in our rivers, they have closed our caves and have run us off the gravel bars. All we want to do is enjoy our retirement and take a simple canoe float and fish a little. That is about all we can afford these days.

I strongly recommend that my state and federal representatives support the No-Action Alternative to the Draft General Management Plan.

Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1530    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 22:20:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Of the options presented I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1531    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 23:11:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We appreciate that the National Park Service has put together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Now please adopt Alternative A which:  
Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;  
Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings; and  
Bars vehicle access to gravel bars.

We really need the Wilderness status designation for Big Spring. Our clean water and wonderful rivers are some of the greatest assets Missouri has.

Thank you for doing all you can to protect them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1532    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 23:41:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Having visited every county in Missouri, I've seen a lot of the beauty of my state. When I was at Alley Spring, the water of Jacks Fork River was so clear and beautiful. There was quiet too.

I've also had the chance to see the clear running water of the Current River. Land owners near these rivers work to keep them clear of the trash and debris thoughtless visitors leave behind.

Illegal roads with ATV use and heavy horse traffic is taking a toll on these rivers within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Alternative A would be my choice for the management plan by the National Park Service.

Within reason, people deserve to experience the outdoors in many ways. But the land shows it has limits. For the sake of all visitors and residents near the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, please choose Alternative A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1533 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 00:05:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My only comment is simply this... why do the local, state and Federal governments always seem to bend to the lobbyists and big businesses at the cost of basic, family-oriented recreation issues?

Please save our Missouri waterways. If there just is not enough tourism to make them relevant - then start spending money on tourism and getting avid waterway users to Missouri to use them, enjoy them. Put together some cleanup groups, advertise around the country for help.

Once these rivers are gone - they will NEVER be the same. STOP pushing off to future generations what CAN BE fixed today.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1534 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 00:55:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Ozarks and the surrounding areas were once an area that I absolutely loved to visit in my youth. Now it seems as if the forest lands and greenery are not only disappearing; it seems as if they are being torn apart by machinery and spillage that is left.

I understand that the people in these areas have a job to do. All I ask is that there be some sort of legislation in place to make these workers work in such a way so that they do not destroy the natural beauty like they are doing today.

Today we are losing far too many of the earth's natural resources. We can never regain these resources once they are gone. Please do not let the Ozark area be one of these resources that we lose.

Sincerely,

David H. Ong, B.S., M.B.A.,M.F.A.M.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1535 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 01:16:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** When I was much younger, my husband and I floated the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers at least once a year. Usually in a Jon Boat leased from Twin Rivers Ranch and later on, a different place.

The water was pristine enough to use for cooking and the countryside mostly untouched. I still remember local names like Seaman Rayfield and Esther Titus.

It was a time to relax and let someone else care for the kids. A time we really looked forward to every year.

One year we brought the horses with us to a small place that had stalls and we were lucky enough to have one of the Rayfields as our guide. The horse crossings were few. (He knew just where to take us)

Looking at what has become of the area is heartbreaking. To return the area to what it once was is important, so future generations could enjoy what we did.

Thank you, Carolyn

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1536 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 01:18:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I love rivers and it makes me sad to see them polluted by machinery and too many animals like horses and cows. I believe we need to keep them clean and banks undisturbed to protect the wildlife and maintain flood control. Overuse and abuse will destroy these wonderful places and creatures and deprive future generations of having their benefits. I support alternative A for management of the Ozark National Scenic Waterways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1537    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 01:19:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The horses can stay, ATV'S must, must go!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1538    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 01:39:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo. Nevertheless I don't believe Alternative B goes far enough. I believe the adoption of Alternative A is better, as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A: Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads; closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings; and bars vehicle access to gravel bars.

In addition, I request that you please advocate for wilderness status designation for Big Spring.

Thank you.

Robin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1539    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 02:32:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Let me thank you all at the Ozark National Park System .. NPS .. for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis as summarized in your "Alternative B".

Adopting it would indeed be a big positive step forward from the status quo.

BUT .. IT DOES NOT GO FAR ENOUGH  
to ENSURE a sustainable and necessary PROTECTION  
for the already damaged "mother nature wilderness"  
surrounding the the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers areas.

Therefore I and my friends and family are recommending  
the adoption of the "Alternative A"  
which has been developed by the Missouri Sierra Club,  
because  
it provides the required additional protections  
for the long term and sustainable existence  
of the rivers and this unique wilderness area.

Most importantly .. Alternative A:

closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads ..

closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings .. and

bars vehicle access to the gravel bars.

And, of course, we strongly advocate the wilderness status designation  
for for the Big Spring river area as well.

WHY ARE MY FAMILY AND I so interested in the further development of this park system?

This wonderful natural park is just 170 miles due south from our home in Richmond Heights, a suburb just several miles to the west of St Louis.

And so we have come to realize how lucky we are to have such a seemingly pristine nature waiting for us when we visit.

In any other direction there is no other park system whatsoever which is so large and so close to us and so attractive.

So we want to do everything we can for the maintenance of this outstanding natural preserve for us and for the future generations.

We are proud to tell our fellow Missourians about the quality of these crystal-clear freshwater springs which go into the Current and Jacks Fork rivers which form the heart of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

These rivers are an ideal place for us to float, canoe, to fish and to camp.

We realize also how important it is that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is the first national park area in America to protect a river system.

And therefore the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers are two of the finest floating rivers we could find anywhere in America.

They are spring-fed, cold and clear, and they are a delight to canoe, swim, boat or fish.

In addition to these two famous rivers, the park provides us hundreds of freshwater springs, caves, trails and historic sites such as Alley Mill as well.

So we cannot urge you enough to do everything you can do to protect and improve for us and future generations the long term preservation of the natural resources which we are so lucky to have created so far with the work of the NPS.

BUT WE MUST DO MORE, and therefore we urge you at the NPS to adopt and promote the "Alternative A".

Thank you so much for what you have done until now!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1540    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 02:46:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Plan A or Plan B? Missouri streams and water ways are not safe to swim in or catch fish to eat, below the Missouri River. As a "former" volunteer member of the Stream Team; picking up trash from the rivers and creeks that I loved...and as an avid camper and outdoor explorer...I was devastated to learn, first hand, that our waters and air could cause a person to become disabled physically or mentally (or both) simply from soil sediment/dust exposure or eating fish. I am more than a little disappointed that our EPA, MDNR, Department of Defense and ATSDR have not made this public knowledge to protect us, but while exposing corporations is not 'politically correct' these days, I understand their cowardice. I will attach links to back up my claims and hope that someone from an environmentally concerned entity does independent research of their own.

Once upon a time...Missouri wanted jobs. I understand that. That is never an excuse to turn a blind eye by allowing toxic substances to be released into the environment through improper incinerations of hazardous substances and ignoring federally banned pesticide regulations (using banned pesticides in Missouri), while harming wildlife and people in the process.(FIFRA) But now that it is done, to HIDE these toxins long term affects from those most prone to be 'infected', who are also (were also) the healthiest of Missourians; outdoorsmen/women, is criminal.

[www.serdp.org/content/.../8236/.../Bioavailability\\_Wkshp\\_Nov\\_2008.pdf](http://www.serdp.org/content/.../8236/.../Bioavailability_Wkshp_Nov_2008.pdf) (DoD and EPA report.)

<http://www.docstoc.com/docs/58594753/Sediment-chemistry-toxicity-and-bioaccumulation-data-report-for-the-sediment-contaminants>

<http://pubs.usgs.gov/wri/wri96-4003/WRIR96-4003.pdf>

<http://www.dnr.mo.gov/env/hwp/docs/rivol1.pdf> (This is the 'Westinghouse' report of Mallinckrodt's toxins, including radiation and 'pesticides'.)

Plan "A" or plan "B" is really irrelevant until ALL of the responsible parties clean up our rivers to make our citizens safe. This would require 'unbiased labs', as sadly, those currently responsible for protecting our health seemingly have become too "impaired" to perform their jobs. And even though all of the total 'fines' (usually in the millions) may add up to trillions of dollars when combined...

- \* those monies were not spent on their intended clean up goals

- \* the money was not spent on testing people for toxic exposures;

- \*\* for those who had children born with birth defects or

- \*\* for those who had to apply for disability after exposure or

- \*\* for those who had to seek mental health care due to toxins altering their behaviors...

- \* The money was not set up as a "Superfund Health Fund for Missourians".

- \* There were no clinics set up to simply chelate the toxins from us (when possible) or

- \* before getting cancer or having a gallbladder or other organs removed. Those corporations walked away with a slap on the wrist while the government sets up National Health Care rather than make the richest of corporations pay for the mess they made and the people they've harmed. This should NOT come out of Disability funds and Social Security and Medicaid/Medicare if testing us for radiation, BHC "666", TCDD dioxin, 2,4-D or DDT, Lindane or Atrazine, etc... would show that a mental or physical issue was due to exposure from the corporate toxins made by THAT/THOSE corporation(s). This is Social Security "Fraud Waste and Abuse" and I have already filed that complaint.

The irresponsible corporations are expecting Tax Payers to pay for the poor health THEY caused by THEIR toxins.

More 'entitlements' FOR them... America now has 11 million disabled people. ( - ) Recently, Wal-Mart was 'fined' 110 Million dollars for further contamination of Missouri(ans). Where is the lab that we can go to for testing of those shamefully unnamed, "erroneously" labeled 'pesticides' that were carelessly combined and distributed all over? Why did they not mention what those toxins were? Where were they used? When did contamination begin?

(Contamination ended, allegedly, in January, 2006) The media is 'lacking' in their reporting:

<http://enewsusa.blogspot.com/2013/05/wal-mart-to-pay-110-million-to-resolve.html>

or

<http://www.fbi.gov/sanfrancisco/press-releases/2013/walmart-pleads-guilty-to-federal-environmental-crimes-admits-civil-violations-and-will-pay-more-than-81-million>

But the richest people in America; the Waltons, or the CEO's of Mallinckrodt, or Syntex, or Monsanto, or Syngenta, etc... THE "1%". they ask that tax payers pay for their mess and leave a "trail of the dead" (wildlife and human) and autistic children or children born with birth defects... so they can use "their" money to ruin some other pristine location as yet undefiled by their presence.

I expect nothing to come of this email. It is 'toxic news' and not to be touched with a ten foot pole, right? Plan A or Plan B? Really?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1541    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 03:39:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank the National Park Service for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo.

Nevertheless, I agree with the Missouri Sierra Club and believe Alternative B does not go far enough. I recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A: Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;

Closes 65 miles of undesigned horse trails and adds no new stream crossings; and

Bars vehicle access to gravel bars.

My wife and I have donated to the Nature Conservancy funds targeted at limiting runoff into the Current and Jack's

Fork rivers. As the habitat for the endangered Ozark Hellbender, a giant salamander, these rivers deserve even more restrictive protection.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1542    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 03:44:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I would like to thank the National Park Service for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo, however, I prefer Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A: closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads; closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings; and bars vehicle access to gravel bars.

I also would like to advocate for wilderness status designation for Big Spring Cite.

I have personally visited Big Spring and I have canoed on the Current River several times.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1543    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 04:17:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please reconsider for Alternative Plan "A".

First I would like to thank the National Park Service for developing the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan/Wilderness Study/EIS. The degradation that has already occurred must be reversed and those people not interested in the future of the park must be stopped from committing their abuses. Although Alternative Plan "B" is an improvement, I feel it still doesn't do enough to bring the abuses under control. From contemplating the past and current abuses by public and business interests to the ONSR and the stated alternative plans of action, it is my opinion that the Alternative Plan "A" would be the best choice.

-Restrict the numbers daily of the equestrian community and related businesses to lessen the damage done to the parks land and rivers. Allowing such numbers that requires warnings of unhealthy Escherichia coli (E. coli) bacteria levels in certain areas of the rivers should be considered unacceptable.

-On the Big Springs Wilderness Area, please NO MOTORIZED VEHICLES! This would better preserve the natural state of the area and eliminate degradation by four wheel drive vehicles, four wheelers and motorcycles.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1544    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 04:38:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Water is important... we know that we can no longer not protect it and the lands around it. Please continue the protection of our river ways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1545    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 04:40:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support active National Park Service (NPS) management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). The Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while allowing reasonable public use.

Of the three alternatives offered by the NPS for ONSR management, Alternative B would be best because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;

- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;

- \*Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;



- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1546    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 04:48:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please choose alternative A as I believe this will result in greater protection.

I am a resident of Missouri and have a strong belief in protecting the riverways for future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1547    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 05:03:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As someone who has floated the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers for over 40 years I would like to say thank you for putting together a plan for keeping the rivers healthy and accessible for years to come. Although Alternative B which you recommend would be a step forward, I would like to recommend Alternative A which closes illegal roads and restores natural condition to 50 miles of these roads; reduces further horse trails and stream crosses and bars vehicle access to gravel bars. In addition, I would like to see wilderness status established for Big Spring- one of the most beautiful spots in southern Missouri. Thank you for your consideration=

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1548    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 05:43:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Prefer alternative A.  
As much primitive and natural area as possible. Quiet solitude in which to observe nature.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1549    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 05:51:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I want things to stay the same.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1550    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 05:53:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a avid canoeist and also a cyclist who loves to get out and enjoy the outdoors. I am in full support of your efforts to make the necessary changes to the management of the Ozark Riverways if the management promotes a cleaner river and less damaged adjacent forest.

I grew up with the BWCA in my backdrop and having used both extensively I do beleive removing the motors from this area woould be ideal and keep the horse use to a minimum would be ideal.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1551    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 05:57:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
Please put into place the most complete and rigorous plan for the protection and preservation of Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Although the National Park Service has put together a well done and thoughtful analysis, its recommendation to adopt Alternative B does not go far enough. The adoption of Alternative A provides additional protections for the rivers. Especially:  
Closing illegal roads and restoring natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;

Closing 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adding no new stream crossings; and  
Baring vehicle access to gravel bars.

Wilderness status designation for Big Spring is important to preserve this phenomenon.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1552    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 06:03:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please Protect the Current and Jack Forks River!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1553    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 06:12:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It is vital to protect the Ozark National Scenic Riverways from degradation and destruction due to interests using it in these ways. I support Alternative A- -Alternative B would be a beginning. Give Wilderness status to Big Spring.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1554    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 06:30:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support PLAN A  
WE NEED smaller motor size, fewer horse trails and vehicle access points.  
Also, Big Spring is a treasure worthy of Wilderness designation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1555    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 06:33:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Ladies and Gentlemen- -

Your two plan options represent important improvements in the revitalization of the water sheds. I would urge, however, that you undertake option A to ensure the enduring, stronger protections for the area so that it will be available for future generations. From the perspective of a non-professional, it appears that Option A more strongly protects this treasured area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1556    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 06:34:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE KEEP THE RIVERS WATERWAYS, FOREST AND NATURE IN ITS NATURAL BEAUTY, IT IS NOT NICE TO FOOL MOTHER NATURE,OR HAVENT YOU BEEN PAYING ATTENTION!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1557    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 06:55:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'd like to thank the National Park Service for putting together a very detailed analysis of these rivers. My family was raised along the Current River. I've personally spent a lot of time on these rivers, as well as most rivers in the state. I've seen the damage caused by ATV's and trucks on the Black River before regulations were in place. The Current and Jack's Fork rivers are true jewels not found anywhere else on earth. These rivers have slowly been deteriorating over time due to feces from horse back riding, and damage from motorized vehicles. Adopting Alternative B would be a positive step forward, but it does not provide the protection that these jewels desperately need. Only Alternative A will close the illegal roads and horse trails that are causing the damage to these rivers, and bars vehicle access to gravel bars. Big Spring is a true treasure, and should be designated as wilderness. I urge you to adopt Alternative A as the only way to keep these rivers as the jewels that they are well into the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1558    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 07:03:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Missouri has been blessed with beautiful spring fed streams. Some of my most wonderful childhood memories have swirled around in the eddies of the Current and Jacks Fork rivers since the late 1960's. Many of my most wonderful adult memories swirl around sharing these same streams with my children. I support option A, in hopes that my children and children's children can also enjoy the same clear beautiful Eco system!

Thank you  
Tom Miles

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1559 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 07:05:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the strongest and most protective plan regarding the federal lands around the current and Jack's Fork River. It belongs to all of us, not just to the people who happened to live close by. I live on the Mississippi, but I don't consider it mine. These precious rivers deserve and need strong protection.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1560 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 07:07:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Option A makes the most sense as it provides actual protections. The status quo is a sad state of affairs with folks bushwhacking their way to our rivers and disrupting the ecosystem (as well as beauty) of the region. The situation is out of control; the four-wheelers and three-wheelers and four-wheel drive trucks and SUVs muddy the water, contribute to erosion/runoff, and they leak oil, coolant and other fluids into the water. Horses also muddy the water and contribute to eroded banks.

I have seen the destruction/disruption firsthand. I kayak and canoe several rivers- -from the Castor and St. Francis to the Current and Eleven Point and Black. I am amazed and disheartened by what I have seen while paddling and while fishing.

Please provide the protections our river region deserves and needs. Please help educate folks on how such regulations are in the interest of all, including future generations. And when it comes to future generations of trout, and so forth, that future is even closer.

Thanks for listening!

- -Glen Williams

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1561 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 07:12:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** WTF

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1562 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 07:25:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family and I support the No Action Alternative and oppose all others.

In particular, we oppose any regulation of the ability of floaters to freely camp on gravel bars of their choice. My family has been doing this for generations on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. Before the European-Americans, the Native Americans did it. Thousands of years of evidence shows that this type of camping on gravel bars does no longstanding harm to the rivers or the environment. "Evidence" to the contrary, I suspect, is result-oriented evidence.

I would add that, when the land along the rivers was condemned decades ago, the federal government promised the

residents of the Ozarks that, while their right to own land along the rivers would change, their right to freely use the rivers would not. Please do not make this promise another broken promise of the federal government about land usage.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tom Burcham and family

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1563    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 07:28:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Ozark National Riverways is an area dear to my heart. I have been going there to float and camp since the early 70's. I want it preserved as best as possible for future generations. We owe it to them to have the most stringent regulations to protect it's natural beauty. I have been to many other states and realize what a jewel we have in our own backyard. When I go on vacation to other states, nothing compares to these waterways for swimming, fishing and boating (canoes & kayaks). The waters aren't treacherous they are slow meandering, clean and beautiful. Let's protect them as best as possible. That means closing illegal atv trails and keeping horses out of the water. My family has horses, so I am a horse lover, but they don't belong in the river in large groups destroying the streambed. Please protect this wonderful jewel.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1564    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 07:30:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Alternative A to ensure protection for the rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1565    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 07:39:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** RE Ozark National Scenic Waterways

The NPS has compiled an thoughtful analysis. And although Alternative B is a step in the right direction, please allow me to add my support to adoption of Alternative A to provide further protection for our rivers.

Here in Missouri, we have no coastline, no majestic snow-capped mountains, but we DO have the beautiful spring fed rivers in the southern part of our state. "Tubing and canoeing those rivers is a part of my and our children's history. One of my most cherished memories is that of my high-school age son and daughter snuggled up beside me in a tent while we waited out a night time thunderstorm on the banks of the Jack's Fork (hoping not to get washed away!).

I can't wait for our grandchildren to get old enough to take on their first float trip down the Current.

Unfortunately, these priceless treasures are being abused.

Please adopt Alternative A to close the illegal roads and restore surround roads to their natural states. Please keep vehicles off the fragile gravel bars. Please close undesignated horse trails and bar additional stream crossings. PLEASE protect Big Spring with Wilderness Status. If you have ever been there, you will understand why.

Thank you for your continued efforts on the behalf of our state and our rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1566    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 07:42:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please, adopt Plan A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1567 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 07:50:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Alternative A. I don't think there should be motor boats on the river. They disturb the peace and quiet and put oil in the river. dI don't think campers should park on the gravel bars. They will cause sewage in the river. I don't think people should cut trails through the forest. I don't think there should be ATV's. Too much noise pollution.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1568 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 07:53:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** the abuses of the Ozark national riverways must be reversed!!! I believe that Alternative A provides additional protections for the rivers needed to effectively protect this beautiful area and ensure future generations are able to enjoy that beauty and solitude that was the vision at the time the park was established.

Grant Holt

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1569 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 07:54:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo.

Nevertheless the Missouri Sierra Club believes Alternative B does not go far enough. We recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:

Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;

Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings; and

Bars vehicle access to gravel bars.

I would also like to see wilderness status designation for Big Spring

My family has enjoyed visiting the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. We go floating, camping and hiking.

Thank you,

Matt Kuehnert

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1570 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 07:56:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** â€I thank the National Park Service for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo.

â€Nevertheless I believe Alternative B does not go far enough. I recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:

â€Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;

â€Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings; and

â€Bars vehicle access to gravel bars.

â€I also advocate for wilderness status designation for Big Spring.

Thank-you, John Glebs

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1571 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 07:58:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please follow sierra club's plan for the Ozark scenic waterways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1572 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 08:03:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please choose alternative plan A for managing the Current and Jacks Forks rivers. It seems to offer the greatest protection for the Rivers.  
Thank You,  
Cynthia Willsey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1573 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 08:07:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Atv use is bad, not only on scenic land, but our country roads as well, but as usual when some big company makes money, oh well. When it's gone it's gone. Here they don't even want us to work in a dry stream to help it and to stabilize it, hence the devastation when it floods. But ruining the land and the peace and quite is fine. Horse trails are getting out of hand too. The government always acts when it doesn't need to, and never when it does. Heavy fines to be used to help these situations will stop lots of this. James

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1574 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 08:08:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I wish to thank the National Park Service for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo. Nevertheless, I believe Alternative B does not go far enough. The Sierra Club and I agree, to recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A: Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads; Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings; and Bars vehicle access to gravel bars.  
I also wish to designate Big Spring as a WILDERNESS AREA. More protection!  
I am 83 years old and have lived and loved Mo. all my life. As a child I spent many wonderful days on the Current River and Big Springs area! My dad, a great fisherman, fished all the rivers and I was there, too! As a parent I took my children, then grandchildren to enjoy the wonders of the Ozarks- -I don't want them ruined by those who care less about others and more about their own pleasures! Now my grown grandchildren appreciate the beauty of Mo. Please save it for future generations! And remember- -a rule is only as good as it is enforced!  
Ruth Foster

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1575 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 08:10:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Although I don't live in the States anymore, I've been enjoying the Jack's Fork and Current rivers since the mid 60's.  
Although it would be impossible to have the region return to the conditions of my youth, I would hope that my children and grandchildren could have the opportunity to enjoy the area in as natural a state as possible.  
I prefer Option A.  
Although there are several reasons I prefer Option A, three stand out in my mind.  
First of all, as a serious paddler I feel the river should be a place for enjoying nature, a chance to get away from it all. The crowds can be more of an obstacle than the root-wads in navigating the river. The ATVs buzzing around and through the river distract from the tranquil image "floating" conjures in my memories.  
The commercial aspects of the rivers is also a concern. Many people in the region depend on this income, and it has helped the economy of the area, but there are unlicensed outfitters that are exacerbating the crowding on the river. The litter, both intentional and unintentional due to tipping, is a big problem. Those of us who consider paddling a hobby seem to be a minority, yet are probably the most passionate about keeping the rivers in pristine conditions since we have invested in our own material to enjoy our pastime.  
Finally, foremost in my mind is the preservation of the endangered Ozark Hellbender. Requiring clean-sediment free water would be hard to maintain with the erosion caused by illegal roads and trails. Losing this member of the ecosystem will forever change the flora and fauna of the rivers in the area.  
Maintaining the status-quo -encouraging more use through commerce friendly policy, continuing to allow environmentally detrimental activities on a more limited basis, will only slow down the degradation of the river

system, which in the long run will end with the eventual extinction of one of the world's largest and unique salamanders. I encourage you to adopt Option A to give the rivers a better chance to recover to an more natural state.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1576    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 08:19:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe that we need to protect as many of our natural habitats as we can. Too many beautiful places have been ruined by abuse, misuse, or thoughtlessness of people. I applaud all efforts that will minimize human impact on natural habitats.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1577    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 08:21:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We are so lucky to have the Ozark Scenic Waterways in our state. We need to do everything possible to protect the pristine waterways. I vote for plan A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1578    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 08:26:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1579    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 08:26:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Option A of the National Park Service Proposal.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1580    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 08:28:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:  
Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;  
Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings; and  
Bars vehicle access to gravel bars.

I also advocate for wilderness status designation for Big Spring. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1581    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 08:35:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of Draft Management Plan Alternative A for the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Alternative A has the strongest protections which I very strongly support. We moved from California to Missouri in 2000, and it is the beautiful rivers that I find most precious (along with the prairies and the woods) here. Allowing them to be degraded and destroyed would be criminal. Missouri lacks the natural features and grandeur of mountains and oceans - it is the rivers and streams that make it unique. Let us do all we can to preserve and protect them!

Thank you!

Allie Gassmann

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1582    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 08:39:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please support Alternative A. No vehicles on gravel bars. Limited vehicle access to any gravel bar. Reduced horse trails. Reduced areas for motor boats. These are the things I would like to see for these rivers and their banks. Please try to keep them wild.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1583    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 08:39:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for this information. I think a lot of effort was used to determine the health of this area of our state. Years ago, my family would float the Jacks Fork and the Current. Even then, I could see the problem of overcrowding beginning to arise. Last year, I visited the springs and was reminded just how beautiful this part of the state is! It is a jewel. I also understand there has to be approved trails for horses and even motorized vehicles. But they should not be allowed to cause erosion and destruction of land and rivers. It will turn into a big ugly, polluted mess! So please save our state's most beautiful treasure! Pass and enforce plan A~ for our future generations!

Thank you again.

Barbara Burke

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1584    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 08:41:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This area is important because of its beauty, water supply, which supports nature in abundance, there many plants indigenous to area, and our identity as a people of this area, our pride. We depend on you to carry this out.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1585    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 08:47:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please adopt the Sierra Club Alternative A. It provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:

Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;

Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings; and

Bars vehicle access to gravel bars.



It is understandable that people want adventure but the 'extreme sport, over the top, disregard for everything' attitude of today guarantees there will be few, if any, remaining pristine areas for us, or any future generation, to enjoy because of the wanton destruction of these areas by the 'extreme' crowd.

All National, State and local parks should be closed to such activities because we all know that these 'extreme' folks have little regard for the laws that protect these areas and will not stay in the designated areas for their sport.

Please protect these River areas for all future generation to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1586    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 08:47:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In light of recent abuses which are rapidly degrading some of the most beautiful scenic areas of mid-America (not to mention precious water resources), I think it is essential that the Federal Government assume responsibility for following thru on the "promise" made years ago when the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers were designated to be National Scenic Waterways. That responsibility would include all the provisions in Alternative A of the proposed management plan. I strongly disagree with residents of the area who fear a loss of tourism (and its inherent income); in fact, the reduction of pollution and damage that would follow closing illegal roads and undesignated horse trails as well as preventing vehicle access to gravel bars should attract ever more visitors! It is only by enforcement of such proactive policies that these treasured areas will survive for future generations to appreciate and enjoy.

Thank you.

Gerry Friedman

P.S. At the same time and for the same reasons, Big Spring should be designated a [protected] national wilderness area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1587    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 08:55:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** After reviewing the General Management Plan's four alternative actions I would like to submit that Alternative A is the most likely to advance the original intent of the NPS in providing "a framework for managers to use when making the decisions about how to best protect the NPS Riverways' resources, provide a diverse range of visitor experience opportunities, and manage visitor use, and what kinds of facilities, if any, to develop in the National Riverways."

My family and I have plied the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers for well over 40 years. We have seen the area at its best (natural) and worst (overuse and abuse - '80s). Our extended family, who travel from a variety of states, always look forward to our stay and adventures along the Jacks Fork and Current. As a teacher who belongs to MSTA I have used our Bunker Hill Ranch Resort almost every year since 1978. We have brought our children to play and "relax" among the natural wonders of the area, floating many times from the input and outlets along both rivers. Now, we are bring our children and their children to replicate our experiences and it seems to be working fairly well. But, there have been some events as mentioned in the analysis that have complicated our excursions and at times ruined our outings. Foremost is the amount of E-Coli in the rivers. On most occasions, when floating the Jacks Fork River, we take out just above Eminence, Missouri. It is below this point that we most encounter large number of horses in and along the river. Since we have so many children with us we don't want to chance a bad health experience after our visit. I will also wonder whether the death of my son was a result of "bad" water in my son's lungs. However, he was so disabled (multiple disabilities) to begin with and just recuperating from surgery nine weeks before, that he was susceptible to any attack on his physicality. So, no I couldn't blame our misfortune on the river. In fact it was our visitations to the Rivers and Woods that most represented our happiness with him. But, I can't help thinking that other children are at risk to poor health, and the loss of the pristine nature of our most valuable resource - the best of nature. The whole area needs to be protected by Wilderness designation, but at least consider the Big Springs Study Area. We just visited there last year; it deserves this attention.

I could go on, but this final thought: With increasing age, as many of you know, the deterioration of time, attention, and earnestness can waste our humanity and heritage. Let us not relate to our posterity the lament that once long ago

Missouri claimed its own "riverways of the mind". But, now, my children, we can only read about it in books.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1588 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 09:00:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly feel that the protective measures proposed in Alternative A of this Management Plan for the 4 Ozark National Scenic Waterways (Jacks Fork and Current Rivers) should be adopted.....and ENFORCED.....as soon as possible.  
Thank you,  
I.J. Friedman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1589 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 09:03:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have paddled the Current and Jacks Fork rivers since 1960. They are immensely beautiful. They have been steadily and severely degraded by a variety of inappropriate uses and practices. Alternative A offers the best hope of saving this uniquely beautiful natural area. Alternative B would be a second, but less effective, option.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1590 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 09:15:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a long time (40 years) user of the ONSR. My use varies between fly fishing on the upper Current, spin fishing on the Jack's Fork and mid/lower Current, wading, canoeing, jet boating, camping, and hiking. In general, I believe the NPS has done an admirable job with the ONSR, especially considering the consistent underfunding of the NPS over the past 30 years or so. So thank you for your efforts.

I support the NPS choice of 'Alternative Plan B'. It appears to strike the best balance of the various activities and needs. I especially support the elimination of motorized boats on the upper part of the Current River while implementing the 60/40 limit on the mid/lower part of the Current. There's no need to have a motorized boat on the upper Current.

Sincerely,

Andy Jury

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1591 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 09:17:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** These comments address the draft General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). This fragile ecosystem requires great care to protect its functions and processes while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

I recommend that you select and implement Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail use within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas

of our state. It should be managed for the enjoyment of current and future generations of all our citizens.

Thank you for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource. Please keep me informed of your decision in this process.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1592    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 09:22:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the fine analysis. I am 80yrs of age, and have been flowing the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers since about 15. I fully endorse Alternative A plus Wilderness status for Big Spring. Thank you for your consideration of my choice.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1593    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 09:27:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I fully support alternative A in regards to the management plan to be adopted by the NPS. These rivers are significant natural resources that should be protected from any threats to their biological integrity. I have floated both rivers many times. I have witnessed horses shitting up every place they are allowed. I even witnessed a vehicle that was driven straight into the river right beside Jacks Fork Campground. These rednecks need to have some regulations to follow and someone to enforce them or they will mess up the river completely. Tell the horse people to ride their beasts back to Europe where they belong. And tell the redneck hicks to stay up out of the river with their trucks and beer cans. Missouri is one of the most environmentally awful places to live. It's an agricultural wasteland with patches of forest and woodland filled with invasive plants. All of the rivers have been channelized and polluted almost beyond repair. Can't we just protect one river or is that too much to ask?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1594    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 09:29:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on management of the Ozarks National Scenic Riverways. And I thank the National Park Service for compiling a comprehensive and valid analysis.

While adopting the NPS recommended Alternative B, would be a step in the right direction and improve the status quo, I strongly urge adoption of Alternative A. Only "A" provides the following additional protections essential to manage these rivers for the future: a) closure of illegal roads and restoration of natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads; b) closure of 65 miles of undesignated horse trails without adding new stream crossings; and c) barring vehicle access to gravel bars.

I am appalled that there are ten times more access points than thirty years ago, approximately when I first experienced the joy of canoeing these beautiful natural rivers - first as a boy scout and later with my own family. Management of these waters must preserve the natural experience for future generations and prevent overuse in which the sheer numbers and frequency of visits may destroy the very essence of what makes the Ozark National Scenic Riverways so special.

The revised management plan must: a) reduce access points; b) reform administration of easements; c) reduce large/commercial horseback trips and their resulting impacts; and d) improve management to reduce overcrowding.

Finally, the plan must staunchly defend and protect the remaining wilderness areas and provide wilderness status designation for Big Spring. The opportunities for individuals to experience wilderness (infrequently and prudently) within the Midwest - and specifically within Missouri are extremely limited. As an hiker and occasional backpacker, I know that we must preserve remaining public wilderness where ever and when ever we can!

Thank you for considering my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1595    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 09:29:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in support of Alternative A regarding the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General

Management Plan.

I support it because it closes illegal roads, and restores the natural conditions. People with horses and vehicles driving along the river banks, and crossing streams wherever they want degrade the waterways!

I support Alternative A because it would close 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings, plus it bars vehicles from gravel bars. Motorized vehicles of any kind do not belong on gravel bars. Just because people live along the river, it shouldn't give them the right to ruin the area as they see fit. They do not deserve more rights than anyone else who visits the riverways.

Also, Big Spring deserves wilderness status.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1596    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 09:33:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please help preserve wildlife by protecting the riverways from damaging motorized vehicles.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1597    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 09:37:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My thanks to the NPS for putting together a management plan for the Ozark Scenic Riverways. It's a tough job to address the many views and issues that face the rivers. I like plan B that the NPS has endorsed, but am afraid it does not go far enough in addressing problems with the rivers. We have floated the upper Current River in the last couple of years and have noticed new access points, more horse traffic, and vehicles parked by the side of the river. These new access areas need to be closed. I think motorized boats should be kept off the upper stretches of the river. Therefore, I support plan A and hope the NPS will consider adopting it or at least some aspects of it. I also think the Big Springs land adjacent to the river should become a wilderness as proposed. I've hiked and backpacked in a number of Missouri's wilderness areas and believe Big Springs would make a great addition.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1598    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 09:41:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I do not think that it is fair to limit the use of public grounds to just a few people. National parks are for everyone. With the increasing population and smaller farms it is important that the parks remain open to everyone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1599    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 09:51:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Wild lands are increasingly under pressure as our population rises, so require extra protection to preserve them. I would prefer plan A that closes illegal roads and eliminates undesignated horse trails. Wilderness designation provides extra protection for wild places from the encroachment of the destructive aspects of modernity, so I favor that designation for Big Spring.

---

Thanks for your efforts to protect this resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1600    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 09:55:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Current & Jacks Forks area are one of the most beautiful & pristine areas in MO. and in the Country as are Big Springs & Johnsons Shut-ins, all of which we have visited many times & intend to visit again.

We feel that alternative A is the best choice and beg you to consider it for the following reasons:

Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads; Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings; and Bars vehicle access to gravel bars.

Thanks for your consideration!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1601    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 09:59:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Plan A is best. Plan B is acceptable. Anything else would be a disaster.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1602    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 10:00:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I prefer option "A". We need areas to enjoy the quiet of nature, and areas where wildlife may go about their lives relatively undisturbed.

Motorized vehicles are disruptive to other visitors. They ruin other visitors' enjoyment of wild areas with their noise, exhaust, stream muddying, and trail degradation. These vehicles create a "second-hand smoke" effect, where one person (or one group of persons) has an outsize effect on others. I applaud all efforts to curtail their access to this area.

Overuse of the park by horse riders and watercraft also damages water quality and river/stream health, so sensible limits on these activities are needed to protect and conserve the park's resources and ecology.

Thank you for considering my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1603    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 10:01:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the ecosystems and wildness of the area should be protected and preserved, but it should continue to provide public enjoyment and use as well.

I like Alternative A the best because it closes illegal roads and restores the natural conditions, because it closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings, and because it bars vehicles from gravel bars. Vehicles of any type do not belong on gravel bars. We have to protect our waterways for future generations. The people who live on the river should have to follow the same laws as the rest of us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1604    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 10:19:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** You might hear people say that by applying some restrictions to the use of wild and beautiful places, we will be "excluding" them from those very places. The truth is that such restrictions serve to include future generations, and the absence of restrictions destroy the very places all of us enjoy. "Freedom" and "license" are two very different things. By protecting the beauty that still remains, we will still have the freedom of experiencing these places while our children, grandchildren, and their descendants will have the chance to experience these places and build the same wonderful memories that we are so fortunate to have. If some people are given the "license" to do anything they want to these places, soon our freedom to enjoy them will be lost forever. Protect the rivers now while there is still something left to protect!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1605    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 10:23:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Jacks Fork and Current River are great natural treasures that should be protected in ways that maintain their natural beauty and environmental integrity at the highest possible levels which is why the NPS should adopt Management Plan A. It is much easier to prevent the degradation of an area than it is to attempt to reverse

damage after it is done, so Plan A which will close illegal roads and restore them to their natural state, close 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and create no new stream crossings, and ban vehicles from gravel bars should be selected over the less stringent Plan B. Also the National Park Service should advocate to the Congress the creation of the proposed Big Spring Wilderness Area. This designation will provide the kind of environmental protection to the 8000 plus pristine acres under consideration that will preserve them now and long into the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1606    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 10:27:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please adopt alternative A of the plan to protect the Current and Jacks Fork rivers. We have too much ATV traffic and other redneck motorists using illegal roads to access various parts that should be left to the pristine natural way of life that nature intended them to be.  
Thank you,

Jim

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1607    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 10:37:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alternative A to protect the Current and Jacks Fork rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1608    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 10:37:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** When gone the clean clear waters, so be the users. When gone the users, so be their tender.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1609    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 10:42:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We support the Alternative A Plan to support our river ways and the use of land surrounding them. We must protect these for future generations to enjoy, protect and use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1610    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 10:45:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I vote for option B. We need to take good care of our lands and waters for all life, while also allowing humans a chance to interact and remember we are part of the natural world.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1611    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 10:49:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have floated these rivers when I was younger with my family and enjoyed every minute. It is such a treasure for the state as well as for our country that we feel that everything should be done to protect these waters. Power boats should be eliminated and numbers of other crafts should be limited to a number which would allow everyone to enjoy the river with respect and quiet. The quality of the water must be maintained!!!! Private interests should not be allowed to pollute these fine areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1612    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 10:50:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have read the gmp and went to all the meetings. The plan is very vague doesn't tell you what is going to be done. The best thing I like about the park is it doesn't feel like you're in a park. I go to the Roberts field area on current river we hunt, fish, camp, just go down there to ride around. It would be a terrible thing to close any access to the river it would congest the ones that are open. The only time that part of river is a little crowded is the holiday weekends the rest of the time hardly anyone there. I am on the river every week. The park service knows where the congested problem is you can't run a boat down to Van Buren the tubes are out of control. I also think that the motor

horsepower limit is to low a 60/40 is the minumn to take a family of 4 in a boat any more restrictions family boating will not exist.A 25hp is the most unsafe restriction ever made they will barley get 2 grown men up the river the jet takes away much more power than people thinks.If the park service wants to change places do it in the set parks like big springs,alley,round springs where the vistors go.Put more thought in how to slow the gravel build up down, it is NOT coming from the roads it is coming from the creeks, in 50 years there will be parts of the river will just be a gravel bed look at some of the big creeks like pike,logan,blar in the 60s people gigged and fished these creeks,now that is impossible.We need gravel ponds or something in these creeks to preserve the rivers we have now. If this generation does not do something kids now days will not see the rivers as we do.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1613 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 10:54:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in strong favor of managing these rivers in a manner that preserves them them for all future generations. And this means excluding motorized vehicles that destroy the river beds, and pollute the water with oil and fuel.

I canoe and kayak on the Current and Jacks Fork rivers every year, and have witnessed first-hand the destruction caused by ATVs. While recently kayaking on the Jack's Fork I witnessed a pair of ATV riders crossing the river repeatedly and destroying everything they went over. I am certain that the water washing on the bottom side of the ATV released oil into the river, and I witnessed first hand the noise pollution caused by this.

If this destruction is allowed to continue, these rivers will end up being destroyed and unable to sustain the life they sustain today. The endangered hellbender is one such species that relies upon these rivers for survival.

The time to preserve these rivers is NOW, and I commend the NPS for looking to further protect these invaluable resources. Please protect these rivers to the fullest extent possible.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1614 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 11:00:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a relatively new Missouri resident just recently introduced to the beauty of the Current River, and as citizen who has enjoyed many vacations in National Parks across the country, I encourage the National Park Service to:

adopt Alternative B of the General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

Expansion of quiet and undisturbed (or restored) areas is critical; less access for motorized vehicles and more hiking trails throughout the area should be maximized. Backcountry/wilderness areas, especially the Big Spring area, should be maintained and expanded.

Increased staffing is of utmost importance. Park Rangers enhance visitors' experiences through educational programs, and by enforcing policies so that everyone who comes to ONSR for recreation or makes a living from the ONSR benefits.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1615 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 11:08:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** These rivers belong to all Americans and not just the ones who live close to them. I personally, do not want to float and swim where horse manure is floating and atvs are screaching around. If people are truly concerned about tourism as they say, they would endorse the median plan as a good compromise. How many tourists do you think will go to rivers that are polluted with the above?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1616 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 11:27:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Someone has to look out for this treasure. It is not a human right to destroy pure, clean water.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1617    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 11:28:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for doing a wilderness study on the Ozark Scenic Riverways. It's a beautiful area in Missouri, I only wish it was larger and could become a full on National Park.

I think your recommendation for Alternative B is a great step for protecting wildlife and wilderness area. However, Alternative A provides even more protection for the rivers by closing illegal roads and restores 50 miles of natural area where those roads were, regulating and limiting horse trails, and baring vehicles on gravel bars. I would also love to see Big Spring granted wilderness status.

Can't wait to return there in the spring and summer this year.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1618    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 11:33:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have reviewed the plan alternatives, and I support Plan B. I believe it provides a balanced approach to aspects of park management that need attention.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

GK

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1619    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 11:39:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I basically support Alternative B. However, I like an element of Alt. A which would close illegally established trails and roadways. Those were probably made by ATVs or at least visitors who do not obey the laws of the Park.

No mechanized vehicles should be allowed on the trails except in emergency situations. I support action that will educate people on the delicacy of the environment in the Park and the legacy that we are stewards of.

Protection of the rivers and watershed should be of ultimate importance as well as the native plants, trees and wildlife that populate the Park.

Historical and archeological preservation should be a part of the plan with small venues to provide visitor education and appreciation of such resources.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1620    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:00:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** First I want to thank the National Park Service for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo. Nevertheless I believe Alternative B does not go far enough. After all this is a part of our National Park system and should be managed in the same nearly-pristine condition as our other National Parks. Kowtowing to pressure from locals because they have traditionally abused the river is not a NPS standard, nor in the interest of visitors. I recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:  
Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;  
Closes 65 miles of undesignted horse trails and adds no new stream crossings; and  
Bars vehicle access to gravel bars.  
I also recommend wilderness status designation for Big Spring



Thank you for your consideration of my opinion.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1621 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:02:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As someone with fond memories of canoe trips on the many rivers in Missouri, sometimes camping on gravel bars, etc., I respectfully request that you adopt alternative A to better protect this valuable resource. We owe it to ourselves as well as future generations.

Thank you,

Clifford Schmid

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1622 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:04:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am one who feels that the Current and Jacks Fork river watershed is obviously deteriorating in quality and needs additional protections. This can be measured objectively by water quality measurements or simple observations of the rivers.

The Tea-Party people are throwing tantrums regarding their "freedom" to jet-boat at 50MPH up and down these rivers and to board thousands of horses next to the rivers, and to have unrestricted use of 4WD vehicles along and through the rivers, and basically to treat the rivers as part of their own private backyards, rather than as a national treasure.

The Current and Jack Fork rivers are the finest quality and most beautiful recreational rivers in the region and should be protected. They are under attack by uncaring people and local financial interests.

I strongly support Plan A for these rivers.

Sincerely,

Dave Ewen  
Manchester MO

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1623 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:04:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly support Alternative A in that ensures the best protection for the Ozark Scenic Waterway. I've been all too aware of all the problems occurring in recent months. I also strongly support giving Big Spring wilderness status. If Alternative A is not adopted in the strongest possible terms, it would be a black mark for the Ozark Scenic Waterway, and that's something that should be avoided.  
In conclusion, the NPS should adopt Alternative A and enforce it with vigor in no uncertain terms. That's the right thing to do.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1624 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:06:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The park service's study has taken much into consideration. I'm thankful for its complete and thorough study. I advocate for wilderness status. My family and I enjoy canoeing in the river. It's worth protecting our natural assets for others and future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1625 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:09:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** @Thanks to the National Park Service for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo. I continue to believe, however, that Alternative A is the best plan for our parks and rivers. As a lover of canoeing and camping, finding solace in the wilderness, and caring for the earth I hope you will consider the needs of animals, we humans, and our earth. I have taken youth on trips on the Current River that have actually changed their lives forever! Camping along the Jack Forks has enriched our family.  
Thank you for considering my thoughts, (Waneta) Sue Trowbridge

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1626    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:13:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The NPS does a great service for our park lands. I would ask that the NPS adopt Alternative A rather than ( B ) for the Current and Jacks Fork rivers. Thank you. Mr. E. C. Millard

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1627    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:14:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1628    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:18:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family has been going to the Jack's Fork River for 60 years. My father was a teacher and the Missouri State Teachers Asso. has a large piece of property on the Jack's Fork River which was a gift to the association in the 40's. Of course my parents have passed away, but their children, grandchildren and great grandchildren continue to gather there every Memorial Day from wherever we live. We always thought once the river was part of the National Scenic Riverways that we would be able to enjoy it forever. We thought the river would be protected and that our grandchildren and great grandchildren would be able to enjoy the river. We never thought the National Protection would not be enforced or continued. I'm appalled that the government hasn't taken the appropriate control of the river to ensure it would be there forever as a pristine river for families to enjoy. I'm am shocked that the people who live near the river want to destroy the river in their backyard. Please continue to stand up for one of the nation's great riverways.  
I CHOOSE OPTION 1.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1629    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:30:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Growing up in Eminence I have always enjoyed motor boats on the upper jacks fork river year around. I gig, fish, and enjoy the river. I also take my children to enjoy these as well and it is a tradition. Among other things if someone needs help you can get them there quicker if they are injured. So I am for keeping the motor boats on the upper Jacks Fork and Current River.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1630 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:31:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I PREFER ALTERNATIVE A OF ALL THE CHOICES.

I MAINLY WOULD LIKE TO RESTRICT HORSES COMPLETELY FROM THE RIVER! THEY HAVE NO BUSINESS EVEN BEING ALLOWED IN THE RIVERWAYS SYSTEM.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1631 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:33:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe that closing horse trails will hurt the economy in our town because we depend on tourism to make our living. I do not think the nps should close any existing trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1632 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:34:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I prefer plan b, but a is good also. I would like to see a horse power limit at least above two rivers. I am a jet boat owner, but some folks are simply rude large motors are not necessary up river, and can be dangerous to others. Thanks for your work.  
lrw

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1633 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:35:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I dont think restricting non motorized watercraft at specific landing points should be done. The less people that come to our town will hurt all of our buisnesses that everyone depend on to survive in this town.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1634 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:40:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The following comment is mine to address the degradation of a wonderful linear park which I have been enjoying for the past fifty years. My mother started taking me to Bunker Hill Ranch, part of the Missouri State Teacher Association property on the Jacks Fork River when I was 7 years old. I am a supporter of recreational use in the National Ozark Scenic Riverways. I feel there is room for hikers, backpackers, horseback riders, canoeists, and kayaks.

Problems occur when people alter the environment for their own personal enjoyment or access. I have seen rock climbers bolting routes on rock bluffs, been heckled by rude and overly large groups of inebriated canoeists, seen jet boats fly up the and down the river, seen multiple groups of large RV's and horse trailers parked on the rivers edge, had off road vehicles drive up to and through my campsite, witnessed multiple horses and riders crossing the river, observed piles of garbage from uneducated floater/campers/hunters or other park users. All of these are examples of selfish use of our valuable limited resource and all are unacceptable to me.

The river systems have cleaned themselves, scoured by rising flood waters, but visual cleanliness belies a dirtier scientific truth. I have read studies regarding the ecoli bacteria count which is enough to make swimming unhealthy during certain periods. I have seen piles of toilet paper and bowel movements in the fragile ecosystem of cave entrances, behind bushes, and around gravel bars. Piles of plastic garbage, rusting pieces of metal, cars and car parts,

building materials, etc are infiltrating every log pile of debris from floods which pick up wood and trash to be preserved in mass as flood waters recede.

As a year round hiker, floater and park visitor, the number of trails/roads have increased, not only in number but in size of vehicles that they can accommodate. Horse trailers have been seen doing three point turns just off the rivers edge. What used to be a horse trail or unimproved road is now able to accept large SUV's and RV's. Vehicles come and go at any time of night or day, threatening the leisurely floater and camper.

As a teacher, I have taken groups of students on five day canoe/camping trips on the Current River since 2008. We studied the history of the Ozarks, hydrology, cave systems, flora and fauna, geology and logging. We taught the students to use a pack in/pack out "Leave No Trace" ethic as we traveled in the park. They were instructed on how to use a cat hole, but when in camp we used a "groover", and packed out our waste. We cleaned up campsites of people who left trash behind, made a contest of filling the red mesh recycle bags with aluminum cans. The students were upset by the amount of trash left behind at campsites and on the river.

Since I have a fifty year perspective of river use in the NOSR, and other wilderness area camping around the United States, I would like to offer the following recommendations.

1. Limit roads and access points along the river.
2. Educate park users about proper disposal of waste, before being allowed on the river. We needed to watch films about safety and waste management before getting a permit and being able to go into the Boundary Water Canoe Area. The same was required to get a permit to enter the Grand Canyon.
3. Limit the number of canoeists/horse back riders that are allowed on the river, and limit the size of groups that can travel together.
4. Conduct semi-annual cleanups of the river and haul out the trash and recyclables.
5. Require canoe and horse packing liveries to educate people that use their services about how to protect the natural resources of the park.
6. Close roads down to the river and allow them to recover from abuse and neglect.
7. Close stretches of the river to motor vehicle and motor boat traffic, especially the upper stretches, except for emergency evacuations.
8. Use a permit system to access the trails by foot, horse, or canoe and use these resources to hire additional staff to patrol the park.
9. Add internships to help educate the park visitors and also to restore areas that have been abused.
10. Levy fines for unauthorized use and violations of park rules, hire additional enforcement officers if necessary.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1635	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,01,2014 12:41:12				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My family and I go camping by the river every year. Being able to drive to gravel bars instead of camping in campgrounds is traditional. I dont think closing any access points should be done. My children should always be allowed to camp anywhere on the river with their parents only instead of a campground filled with drunks.I vote no change on closing anything road, landings, and all of this.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1636	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,01,2014 12:42:58				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	After reviewing all the plans, I agree with the National Park Service that plan B is the best alternative. It isn't too radical, but seems to protect the natural resources.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1637	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,01,2014 12:45:40				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Living in Eminence my children and i have enjoyed many days on the jacks fork and current river. we have enjoyed being able to camp along the river. i dont think we should take this away from so many people that enjoy these rivers year round. i vote no change..				

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1638    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:45:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have spent many days and nights on both the Current and Jacks Forks rivers. I have been a personal witness to the ATV use and have seen the damage that is left behind. It has come increasingly evident that the abuse of the river system is increasing since there is no regulation to hinder it...something needs to be done before the ecology of the system is beyond repair. I support both plans, but would like to see plan A put into effect to further the regulations in hopes that the river system is available for my grandchildren to enjoy, because at the steady rate of decline, I don't think it will be. We only miss something when its gone...DON'T let it happen.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1639    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:47:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** i dont think there should be any restrictions on non motorized watercraft. it will hurt our towns and buisnesses. The less people the more our economy suffers. i vote no change.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1640    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:48:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I feel the restricting of horse trails will effect our economy here in eminence. i vote no change.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1641    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:50:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I feel we dont need to change anything with the motor boats. many people have enjoyed this for years. i vote no change.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1642    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:53:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1643    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:54:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for the work the NPS as done on the thoughtful analysis and process for creating a healthier management plan for the Ozark

Scenic Riverways. These rivers are a natural gem in our state, and important to the health of ecosystems - - both natural and economic - - in the region.

Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo that has degraded the rivers.

Nevertheless I believe Alternative B does not go far enough. I would hope that some aspects in Alternative A could be included, to provide additional protections for these riverways. Specifically, I like how Alternative A:

- 1) Bars vehicle access to gravel bars - their noise and water pollution are untenable in these areas.
- 2) Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;
- 3) Closes unapproved horse trails and adds no new stream crossings.

I also strongly encourage you to maintain a wilderness status designation for Big Spring.

My family and I have canoed several segments of these rivers occasionally over the last four decades. Trips where we witnessed vehicles in the water and next to the riverbanks were not nearly as enjoyable as the few when we did not. The damage vehicles and horses have done to the river is obvious to the untrained eye, and I do fear what pollution levels are doing to local plants and animals, as well as visitors playing in the water like my family.

The 'No Action' alternative is absolutely unacceptable to me because it fails to address the need for more enforcement of existing laws and standards, to better manage overcrowding, and to improve communication and partnership with local landowners and communities.

The Current River and Jacks Fork are prime recreational waters in a stunning natural karst area that attracts approximately 1.5 million visitors each year. A 2011 study estimated visitor spending at more than \$55 million with nearly 90 percent of spending from non-local visitors. As a unit of the National Park System, management of the Riverways must ensure protection of the Park's resources in an unimpaired condition for public recreation, education, and scientific value. Among its tasks is sustaining and restoring bio-diversity for the next generation.

The management of ONSR-in terms of resource preservation, sustainable use management, and restoration of natural ecosystems-should match that of our nation's most pristine and unique public lands, because it fits in that category!

Thank you for your attention.

Laura Neuman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1644    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 13:02:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My husband & I were most distressed that when we went to Powder Valley on January 22nd, the roadway into the conservation center was blocked & the only way in was to park quite a distance from the center & then walk uphill to the center in the cold & dark. My husband has a knee injury that made that pretty impossible, & I couldn't leave him sitting in the car for 3 hours while I was inside. So we were unable to input in the convenience of the hearing & see the detailed displays. So after driving in from Franklin County, we were forced to turn around & head back home.

We appreciate all the efforts the NPS has done to give the public a chance to input & to come up with such detailed options for us to consider.

With demands increasing for intrusions into the OSRW, it seems this would be the ideal time to also designate other natural areas before they become degraded. So please establish wilderness status designation for Big Spring.

We have a strong preference for Alternative A because it does a better job of protecting the once-pristine natural beauty of the OSRW. We have spent many wonderful days floating in canoes, swimming in the clear waters, tent camping along the river, & hiking in nature there. We've taken all our four children & the older grandchildren too; & we look forward to introducing the babies to the OSRW when they're a little bigger.

We are distressed that this natural area is being maltreated & degraded in several ways. First, we're concerned that horses are being allowed in the river in so many areas & that they have caused the e-coli count to increase

tremendously. Because of the reports, we've been afraid now to float as far south as the Jacks Fork River, which we used to do. There must be some limits to too many horses in the river. Second, we're also concerned about all the illegal roads & trails to allow horses & vehicles including ATMs close to the river. We picnic on sand bars & don't like seeing vehicles there along the river. Can we no longer escape the noise & pollution in nature?

Third, there should be restrictions keeping commercial & private interests from being seen from the river. We don't appreciate intrusions of an increasing amount of manmade development along the scenic riverway. When we want to experience nature & all it offers, we don't want it overpowered by someone else's special project they wanted to place overlooking the river for their private preferences.

Alternative A seems to do a better job of addressing our concerns. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1645    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 13:12:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Ther plan for the Ozark national park is not sufficent.

It needs to include the following:

- 1) Close illegal roads and restore natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads.
- 2) Close 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and addsnno new stream crossings.
- 3) Bar vehicle access to gravel bars.
- 4) Designate wilderness status designation for Big Spring

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1646    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 13:21:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My comment is in support of Option A. My family spend much time in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and surrounding areas. I understand the need for allowing multiple uses in some areas. This area has tremendous potential for over use. The hordes of floaters and equestrian users have and continue to damage the vicinity. Wild places, once compromised are difficult or impossible to heal. This area has already seen its share of trauma. All that can be done to protect it should be done.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1647    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 13:23:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a resident of Missouri and regular user of the rivers I am in favor of protecting this natural resource for now and the future. My family and I are in favor of the proposed alternative A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1648    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
Ozark National Scenic Riverways is just that... a "National" "Scenic" "Riverway" within the "Ozark" region. It is no less a National Park than Yellowstone or Yosemite. The purpose of creating and maintaining the Ozark Scenic Riverways is to preserve and protect this unique and beautiful area(s) for current and future generations. Preserving the natural aesthetic and protecting the fragile ecosystem.  
I believe that there needs to be tighter controls on preserving these areas. Specifically, unauthorized Roads, ATV Trails, Horse Trails and Hiking trails should be closed and banned from use. In addition, I think that all motorized boats should be banned from all of the designated scenic riverways. These restrictions should be strictly enforced and backed with significant penalties to violators. It has been shown through numerous independent studies of the often irreversible consequences from this type of wide ranging overuse, including, compacted soils, increased erosion, changes to water quality & chemistry, loss of native habitat, reduction of indigenous species, increase in invasive species, and many other negative changes. Furthermore, this overuse is certainly not "scenic". One of the stated purposes of setting aside national lands such as the Ozarks is to preserve the "Scenic", pristine nature of the area. Preserving the scenic natural state of this area does NOT include hundreds of non-native Horses trampling the banks and fouling the water, It does NOT include ATV's and Motorized boats drowning out the quiet serene natural

sounds of the area with their deafening engines. Preserving the natural sounds is not only a peaceful enjoyment, but an actual necessity in maintaining the ecosystem's - such as - the call of a bird, a frog, a cricket, or squirrel. Smell is another extremely important element in nature for feeding & reproduction. Natural scents are overpowered by gasoline fumes, horse excretions, & fouled water from these high-impact activities.

Some people may argue that there are regional economic benefits to allowing these unrestricted activities in National Scenic Riverway areas, however, the contrary is actually true. The greatest economic benefit is in maintaining the pristine nature of the region for eco-tourism, low impact recreation, and conservation for biologic research. These wide ranging national economies far out-weigh the miniscule exploitation of our resources by a few. If individuals and businesses want to participate or offer these high-impact activities, such as horseback riding and motor sports, they are free to do it on private lands outside of our national parks and away from sensitive waterways. In Short: The Ozark National Scenic Riverways... are

Ozark: The Ozarks are a unique geographic, geologic, and ecologic area unlike any other - one that is vitally important and deserving of preservation

National: They belong to all of us as Citizens of this nation. NOT to a few users who choose to exploit these areas for financial and personal gain.

Scenic: These areas are to be maintained in as natural and pristine a state as possible. NOT molded, changed, disrupted, and "developed" into a man-made environment.

Riverways: The Ozark riverway system stretching hundreds of miles is delicately and inseparably connected. It is a series of interconnected mountains, hills, forest, glades, fields, caves, springs, creeks, & rivers. Disruption to any one part of this riverway system alters the balance of the entire system.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1649    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 13:28:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My first thought was how did the NPS allow so much destruction to the riparian corridors?! Granted, there are many miles of shoreline....

Would support Plan A. Area needs at least a few years to regenerate repair to overused/abused areas.

River should NOT be used as a convenient resource for private businesses, especially when it is apparent that no one is taking CARE of this public land!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1650    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 13:32:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I've been canoeing and kayaking the Current river for 40 years and think its about time we had more control of the park and rivers.

Lets got a little control of the horse trails and the number of people and boats on the water and get the water clean again.

Jan Cook

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1651    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 13:33:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We need to protect the Current and Jacks Forks Rivers!

Alternative A is the best solution.

Thank you for listening.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1652    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 13:37:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Alternative A of the Draft General Management Plan for the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, which should give strong protection to the clarity and enduring value of this area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1653    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208



**Received:** Feb,01,2014 13:41:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** First I want to thank the National Park Service for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis, nevertheless I believe it does not go far enough. After all the Current, Jacks Fork river system is a part of our National Park System and should be managed in the same nearly-pristine condition as our other National Parks. Kowtowing to pressure from locals because they have traditionally abused the river is not a NPS standard, nor in the interest of visitors and the future I remember a time when there were no four wheeled anything and no horses. The mess they make is unbelievable, it all ends up in the river for all to see and smell. I believe adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the river. Of most importance, Alternative A: closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads; closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossing and bars vehicle access to gravel bars. I also recommend wilderness status designation for Big Spring. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1654 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 13:44:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Alternative A. My family and I canoed the Current and Jacks Fork rivers for many years with friends and it was a relaxing, positive experience. Our son now lives in South Carolina and still canoes some of the rivers there. I would like to say that I am opposed to any new horse trails near the river and illegal roads cut through the forest. Also, vehicles on gravel bars should not be allowed. There should be a limit on the size of motors on boats as this presents a very real problem if you are in a canoe and the boats pass, creating a large wake which can swamp the canoe. Experienced canoeists know how to turn the boat when the motorboat passes but many do not. One last comment I would like to make. I support wilderness status for Big Spring.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment about a marvelous resource that should be protected.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1655 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 13:59:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of Alternative B for managing Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I am in favor of more direct management of designated horse trails and a permitting system to help maintain existing ones and close non-designated or unapproved trails and restoring those to native habitat.

I also favor or propose a nominal daily use fee for any recreation in the park area. A one to five dollar per day use fee is perfectly reasonable and yearly passes at a significant discount could also be made available for frequent users. 1.5 million visitors each year could generate a significant amount of revenue if it is invested back into the park system.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1656 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 14:16:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please protect the riverways of Missouri. The Jacks Fork and Current Rivers require care and will not withstand long term abuse.

Vehicles do not belong in waterways.

The river banks need to be protected from erosion, at a minimum from man-made contributions from erosion.

Roadways and river access need to be planned thoughtfully and cared for. If the entire riverway is an access point, the river will soon be choked with sediment.

Sincerely

Karen Giovanoni

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1657 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 14:23:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My wife & I were most distressed that when we went to Powder Valley on January 22nd, the roadway into the conservation center was blocked & the only way in was to park quite a distance from the center & then walk uphill to the center in the dark, cold evening. I currently have a bad knee from an injury & that made it impossible for me to hike so far. So the two of us were unable to input in the convenience of the hearing & see the detailed displays. So we drove straight back to our home in Franklin County.

We both appreciate the efforts the NPS has done to give the public a chance to input & to present the detailed plans for us to consider.

We do want to emphasize that we request you establish a wilderness status designation for Big Spring. With demands increasing for intrusions into the OSRW, it seems this would be the best time to also designate other natural areas before they become degraded.

We definitely prefer Alternative A because it does a better job of protecting the once-pristine natural beauty of the OSRW. We have spent many wonderful days floating in canoes, swimming in the clear waters, tent camping along the river, & hiking in nature there. We've taken all our four children & the older grandchildren too; & hope to introduce our newest grand-babies to the natural beauty of the OSRW as well, when they're a little bigger.

I started floating the Current River into the Jacks Fork River in 1952 with friends while in college. Through the years I've seen evidence of increasing mistreatment of the OSRW & have been concerned. I've seen four-wheelers running on sand bars close to people picnicking. I've seen people trashing the scenic beauty-throwing cans & beer bottles in the river & other uncaring activities. We've stopped floating as far south as we used to since we heard about the higher levels of e-coli there in the Jacks Fork River; we used to enjoy that part of the river float.

We are distressed that this natural area is being maltreated & degraded in several ways. First, we're concerned so many horses are being allowed in the river in so many areas & that they have caused the e-coli count to increase tremendously. There must be some limits to too many horses in the river. Second, we're also concerned about all the illegal roads & trails to allow horses & vehicles including the four-wheelers close to the river. We picnic on sand bars & don't like seeing vehicles there along the river. We want to escape the noise & pollution when we're out in the natural environment.

Third, there should be restrictions keeping commercial & private interests from being seen from the river. We don't appreciate intrusions of an increasing amount of manmade development along the scenic riverway. When we go to experience nature & all it offers, we don't want it overpowered by someone else's special project they wanted to place overlooking the river for their private preferences or commercial value to those few individuals.

Alternative A seems to do a better job of addressing our concerns. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1658 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 14:23:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Protect our beautiful Missouri rivers and streams. I support Proposal A, or at the very least, Proposal B.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1659 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 14:24:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family has been floating the Current and Jack's Fork river since 1971. We have seen many changes to the management of this area, some good, some bad. The addition of motor boats on the lower Current and the use of ATV's and horse trails through both rivers has severely impacted the natural beauty and ability of all to enjoy this great natural resource. I would like to take my grandchildren to see and enjoy these natural and free-flowing streams in our state. I urge adoption of Alternate Plan A to the proposed management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1660 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 14:51:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like for you to leave things alone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1661 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 14:54:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I'd like to thank the NPS for the recently released Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan for the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, is a very positive step. I believe supporting Alternative A would offer the strongest and also additional protections for these rivers and would be the best opportunity to make a change for the better.

I support Alternative A to ensure the strongest protections for the Current and Jacks Fork rivers.

Additionally, I support wilderness status designation of Big Spring.

Please, do everything you can to protect our beautiful rivers!

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1662 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 15:02:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I support option A- it seems to be the most adequate option to protect the OSNR because:

I like the idea of closing illegal roads and restore 50 miles of them with native vegetation.

The closing of illegal horse trails and the no addition of new stream crossings.

and because will not allowed vehicle access to gravel bars

This option would allow the ecosystems to recover and be protected for further abuse.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1663 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 15:06:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Editions to previous comment:

I support option A- it seems to be the most adequate option to protect the OSNR because:

I like the idea of closing illegal roads and restore 50 miles of them with native vegetation. I like the closing of illegal

horse trails and the no addition of new stream crossings and because vehicle access will not allowed in gravel bars

This option would allow the ecosystems to recover and be protected from further abuse.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1664 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 15:13:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thanks to the National Park Service for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis.

Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo.

However, Alternative B does not go far enough. We recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:

Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;

Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings; and

Bars vehicle access to gravel bars.

We need the most aggressive protection possible in order that our best natural resources, our Missouri rivers, be properly maintained in their natural state for the enjoyment of our childrens' childrens' children. It is our responsibility to do this.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1665 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 15:17:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for the extensive evaluation of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

I have enjoyed many vacations along the upper Jack's Fork River and float trips on the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers over the past forty years. I consider it a precious and fragile area. I appreciate access for canoeing and fishing but know that we must not be too intrusive on this lovely environment. We must maintain and preserve it.

I prefer Alternative A since it would preserve the most wilderness while still allowing access by visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1666    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 15:40:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PROTECT THE HABITATS OF OUR BIRDS! THERE IS TOO MUCH HUMAN ENCROACHMENT GOING ON AS IT IS WITHOUT COMPOUNDING THE PROBLEM.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1667    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 15:43:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Missouri is a beautiful state and a big part of that beauty are our rivers. The Current and Jacks Fork are gems to be treasured. As is the entire Big Spring area. It is so important that these areas are designated wilderness status and protected for future generations. I believe Alternative A would protect the rivers as they need protection. Too much of our natural world is being destroyed, let's protect what we have as best we can. Thank you, Margaret Foege

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1668    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 15:45:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think you should ENFORCE THE LAWS YOU HAVE NOW! I cannot believe all the illegal access roads you leave open. I am actually afraid to camp anywhere along the rivers. There will be an unwelcome visitor, either someone on a horse or a redneck in an ORV. PLEASE CLOSE THESE ILLEGAL ROADS.

I am not fond of any of the plans you propose. I think all horses should be banned. I don't mind anyone using the river for swimming, boating, fishing, hunting, trapping, or just hanging out. Just restrict the areas open to vehicles.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1669    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 15:50:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a concerned citizen, I would like to voice my concerns on the continued adverse practices that are continuing to be a detriment to the waterways in our beautiful Missouri Ozarks country. The countryside, streams, and rivers are increasingly being subjected to large and small jet-boats along with individuals using jet skis and ATV's. ATV's are leaving tracks along the country and river beds as they currently are often being driven into the water. There is often gunfire along the waterways, and vehicles are allowed to park in gravel bars and along the river/stream banks. This not only tears up the country, which in itself is horrific, but the wildlife is being scared and sometimes even killed. These practices need to be stopped as quickly as possible to ensure the safety of the waterways, country and wildlife!

Along with many other concerned individuals/voters, I would like to ask for the creation of a management plan to determine what can be done to address these issues. We quickly need to work on stopping the degradation of the waterways in our wonderful Ozark country before it is too late!

Thank you for your help in this matter.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1670    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 15:59:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I recommend Alternative Plan A, as I believe it would better preserve the land and riverways.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1671    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 16:00:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:  
â€C Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;  
â€C Closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings; and  
â€C Bars vehicle access to gravel bars.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1672    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 16:09:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** First of all, let me commend you for recognizing that changes in the last few decades have lead to a different ONSR than was originally intended and that changes to the system should be considered. Although I agree that changes should be considered, I must admit I am disappointed in the options presented as they don't seem to focus on the root problems in my opinion.

Just to be clear, I'll give you a little background on myself and my experiences within the ONSR. I am 49 yrs old, have been coming to the Montauk and ONSR area since I was 16 yrs old. More than 95% o my time at ONSR has been on the upper current river between Cedar Grove and Montauk Park. Thus my knowledge base and comments are directed specifically to this area. I have hunted and fished these areas extensively and have canoed the river many more times than I can count.

I currently live in Defiance, MO (west of STL) but I also have a very small piece of property with a camper near the Parker's Ford Access. I am not a local but also not someone who visits the park once a year or less. I spend probably 50 days or more per year at my camper chasing trout, turkeys, morels, and solitude with family and friends. I have friends who are locals and friends who like me own property and spend many weekends and days enjoying the ONSR. I have friends who ride horses and friends on ATV's. Friends with canoes and even know a boater or two.

Every person that I know, on each side of the aisle, would agree that over the past two decades, the ONSR experience on this portion of the river has changed. And the reason is very simple, there are just more people accessing the river than ever before. 25 years ago, horses were almost non existent in the areas I was camping and fishing. ATV's were in their infancy and UTV's didn't even exist. Now they are a common site throughout the ONSR and, of particular interest to me, the private land near the ONSR. Now before the horse lovers and ATV riders begin to bristle, I am not saying anything negative about either.....just the recognition that this is an evolving condition and that both horse and ATV traffic is increasing.

So that's who I am....just a regular guy trying to enjoy the Upper Current River portion of the ONSR.

That said, I have to say that I am fairly disappointed in the options presented. My primary disappointment is that all of the options presented, including the No Change Option, all seem to do everything they can to promote additional visitation to the park and development of resources when increased traffic is the root of the problem to start with. Now obviously, I can't say with a straight face that we should limit visitation to the park. We can't do that. However, you can and should work harder to enforce the rules already on the books. The vast majority of all the visceral comments I have read from horse lovers, horse haters, ATV lovers, ATV haters, floaters, boaters, hikers, and tree huggers are primarily the result of a small portion of the population breaking the rules. Rude, obnoxious behavior isn't limited to either locals or weekenders or even in betweeners like me. But it is this rude, unlawful behavior that is the root of much of the conflict on the river. Nobody wants to have their family witness some drunken idiot fighting or peeing in the river on a float trip. That ruins it for everyone.

The same goes for conflicts with ATV's, Horses, sand bar camping, and fishing regulations. Incosnistent and lack of enforcement of the rules has created confusion and that has lead to tensions that will only escalate until a steady and consistent enforcement of law exists.

Yet, the two options I favor, if I am interpreting your 500 page document correctly, do not provide resources for additional resources to ENFORCE THE EXISTING LAWS!!! Instead, your proposed plan as well as options A and C seem to spend money on Historical structures, Oral history programs, establishing a curatorial hub (heck, I don't even know what that is), guided tours, learning centers, and archeological preservation.

Perhaps I'm just not cultured enough to appreciate these amenities but I would venture to say that less than 10% of the ONSR visitors and in particular those that spend a lot of time on the ONSR could care less about these activities. My love of the ONSR is fishing, hiking, camping, and the solitude of nature and I am not alone. An oral history program appeals to less than 1% of visitors. And let's remember, after all, it is our river and our tax money that supports it. It is NOT yours to spend on your own agenda. Here's a thought....how about putting it to a vote. More agents to support existing laws vs. learning centers and a curatorial hub.....I wonder what locals, weekenders, and in-betweeners like me would vote for.

It is my opinion that you should spend those funds on hiring more agents and enforcing the laws you have on the books now. Maybe buy more land to add to the ONSR to spread out the increased visitation. It isn't rocket science fella's. Weed out the drunk obnoxious floaters and boaters and you will find river harmony returns quicker than if you have a regional curatorial hub. Why in the world wouldn't the "no Change Option" have some level of increased enforcement if the Options B and C do??? That's crazy and doesn't fairly address the real root cause of the ONSR conflicts that occur except in your preferred options. The ONSR is not "yours" gentlemen!! It's ours and the solutions should be tailored to make the majority happy, not you and the special interest groups that you cater to.

Secondly, I must say I'm disappointed to see that absolutely no mention of ATV's or UTV's. ATV's are as much a part of the current culture of the area as horses. Many more locals and folks like me have ATV's than horses. Yes there are conflicts between the groups but again, those are attributable, by and large, to a minority of the population that a little increased enforcement efforts might clean up. But why do horses and gravel bars garner so much attention and ATV's are left in the cold. Please do not tell me that horses impact the land and water less....I can take you to ruts 3 ft deep that are the result of horses, not ATV's and have sediment just rolling into the river when it rains....and ATV's don't poop. A little knowledge of the biological cycles and you would understand that ATV's impact water quality less than horses. Again, not trying to get the horse crowds fired up. I recognize their right to be there within the limits of the law too. In fact, I think it's cool and I'm not a horse guy by any stretch. It just seems to me that ATV's have been completely left in the cold and it's not fair....again, seems to be your agenda and not the users of the ONSR.

And if it is less traffic the trails need and that's your excuse for excluding discussion of ATV's, then why the heck would you add another complete class of access in the form of mountain bikers. Again, if the area doesn't need anymore traffic, why would you create more....yet existing users of ATV's are snubbed. Unacceptable in my opinion that ATV riders didn't even get a voice at the table.

Finally, you have created a 500 plus page document yet there are few if any specifics. Perhaps you helped draft the Affordable Care Act?? Your options and even the no change option all mention closing trails, roads, access points, and gravel bars. Yet in all the 500 pages I didn't see any specifics at all. In my little corner of the ONSR, if you closed the Parker's Ford Access, it would be a disaster in my world. At 49, learning to ride a horse is likely a bad idea for me. I can't see how or why you would do that but, there's nothing to say you wouldn't. How about the road that joins Parker's Ford and Cedar Grove as another example. I use that frequently. Are you going to close that in one plan and leave it open in another?? Those kinds of details might help people formulate a better response to your vague references. I'm sure many people like me have very specific questions that mean everything in their little part of the ONSR yet have no idea which plan to support due to the lack of specific information.

Not to mention the financial impact that closing and opening specific access points would create. I have only a small financial impact if the Parker's Ford Access closed and became for instance some type of walk in area or just closed completely. But I have friends, both local and non-local, that could be seriously impacted financially if substantial changes occur within any of the various options. They have literally hundreds of thousands of dollars invested and somewhat centered around that particular point in the river. Don't you think you owe it to the stake holders in the area to document some of these specifics for them to formulate their own responses and lobby for their own welfare. Instead, they are left to wonder what a bureaucrat will decide?? The concept of substantially impacting someone's financial well being without giving them adequate detail to respond and defend their rights and positions is what

you've created in your document. Not only is that unfair and unethical, it seems to me to border on illegal.

In closing, again I think it's great that the ONSR Management team has identified a need for review. Unfortunately, I think you truly missed the boat in solving the problem. A simple common sense approach of minimal change along with substantial enforcement of existing laws should have been considered. Instead, you've used this as an opportunity to cater to special interests from the Sierra Club, horse lobby, archeological study groups, and your own special interests instead of the common ONSR user.....I hope our park doesn't suffer as a result of your decisions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1673    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 16:17:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to comment on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Draft General Management Plan.

Missouri deeded our lands over to the Federal Government with the promise that they would always be accessible and available to the people of Missouri and the people of our nation to come and enjoy. I think this is an encroachment on the promise that was made. We chose to protect the rivers like it is right now and that is what we want to see continued. We were the people that first started protecting the river long before the federal government came in and got involved. We're ready to take it back if we need to.

I strongly recommend that my state and federal representatives support the No-Action Alternative to the Draft General Management Plan.

Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1674    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 16:45:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family supports alternative A. We love to float these streams, keep them for our future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1675    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 16:49:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

I prefer Alternative A because it protects and restores important ecosystem features in the ONSR; restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1676    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 17:27:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Just want to say that I am in favor of boosting regulations and limiting access to keep the rivers as beautiful as they are now! Locals may not realize it but that is where their wealth is.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1677    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 17:41:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Park Planning, National Park Service

I support Alternative A to ensure strong protection of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. We do not need more horse trails nor do we need vehicles on gravel bars. These rivers are jewels in Missouri's crown. Let us keep them for future generations and for those who still enjoy the natural world. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1678 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 18:02:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please support and implement alternative A in the plan for the ozark national scenic riverways. This alternative offers the strongest protection for the rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1679 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 18:13:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would recommend that the park have a well trained law enforcement force to protect the visitors and resources. I believe the additional motor restriction on the upper current are not necessary and the motor limit on the lower current could be compromised at the 150 h level.

I would also like to see more family oriented facilities in the developed areas. Things like playgrounds, volleyball courts, and horse shoes, ect. This would help to provide a wider range of recreation opportunities. I would also encourage partnership with other land management agencies to promote Eco-touism. This might allow for a longer season and a more dispersed visitor use. Use the media to highlight positive accomplishments within the park and the general area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1680 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 18:22:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** S O S

Save Our Streams

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1681 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 18:23:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Whatever plan is devised I would like the water to be pure and the scenery beautiful. Good luck. You have a daunting challenge ahead of you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1682 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 19:09:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think we are so lucky to have these beautiful rivers in our state. It is only natural to want to preserve them. Motor vehicles and horses have there places to go but these rivers are easily disturbed. I'm in a wheel chair and I could see me using it to get to the river but that's as far as I would go. No riding in the water anywhere. The wildlife has to be taken into consideration at all times. We must keep the rivers clean and pristine for not only the people who use these rivers but also the animals in and around the rivers. Lets make these rivers a scenic part of Missouri waterways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1683 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 19:10:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Preserving our local resources should be number one!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1684 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 19:45:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Re: Ozark Scenic Rivers / General Management Plan

I have done the best I can to read through the various options from the General Management Plan. I am glad to see that you have the foresight to address the various issues that are mushrooming within the park. My comments are as follows;



1. I am a wilderness advocate, but I do not see the value of having a postage stamp wilderness. I would prefer the resources be used elsewhere.
2. I think that vehicular access to the river itself needs to be limited. The current managed access points seem to be adequate to reach any portion of the river by watercraft or on foot.
3. Motorized watercraft usage also need to be eliminated in the smaller, upper reaches of the rivers, above Alley Springs on the Jacks Fork and above Akers on the Current. There is not enough water in those stretches to make motor craft usage safe to others using the rivers.
4. Horse usage should have limited access to the rivers as well as a buffer zone to allow animal waste to breakdown before entering the rivers. The safety and health aspects of these restrictions seem obvious.
5. It seems that an additional horse oriented campground would not be a threat as long as it was well insulated from direct access to the rivers or major tributaries.
6. In general Alternative B seemed to cover the best options overall.
7. It seems that there is room for cross choices across alternative plans.

My usage is limited to the sections above Round Springs on the Current River and above Alley Springs on the Jack Fork River.

Dan Curran  
814 Pebble Lake  
Ballwin, MO 63011

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1685	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,01,2014 21:01:10				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have a few questions and would like to comment on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Draft General Management Plan.				

Why did the National Park Service hold a informational meeting in St. Louis / Kirkwood, Missouri when they are located over 100 miles from the Ozark National Scenic Riverways? It is my understanding that the National Park Service is planning a big expansion on the Gateway Arch costing millions. Will the National Park Service come down here and have an informational meeting on that? Why does the National Park Service fly in, out of state park rangers to support an informational meeting when they have no knowledge of the rivers here, the local communities, the local businesses, the culture or the people that use the rivers and parks?

I noted that the Draft General Management Plan for the ONSR requires an Environmental Impact Statement and consideration for the impact of Global Warming. I'm just a simple man, but it is clear to me that the National Park Service is having a greater impact on Global Warming then me paddling my canoe down the river. This all smells like there's a skunk in the woodpile....

I strongly recommend that my state and federal representatives support the No-Action Alternative to the Draft General Management Plan and take a look at turning our rivers back to the state of Missouri and let the Missouri Department of Conservation and our Missouri Department of Natural Resources take control of our rivers.

Thank you

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1686	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 00:04:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please consider A rather than B. I've spent many happy days in the area, canoeing and camping and wish to preserve the countryside rather than see it despoiled by extra roads and the depredations of tourists.				

Thank you for all your work.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1687    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 00:23:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I grew up in the St. Louis metropolitan area and would make several annual trips to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (mainly the Current River, but also the Jacks Fork River). During the trips with friends, we always enjoyed the natural beauty and quietness of floating down the river in a canoe while absorbing the natural wonder of the area.

I still try to make trips to the areas with my nephews so they can enjoy the beauty of the Current River and surrounding forests, much like my uncle took me when I was younger. After many years of travel, however, I have noticed that many activities, specifically all terrain vehicles ("ATVs") as well as 4-wheel drive vehicles were destroying the peacefulness as well as the natural habitat.

After reviewing the four proposals (A, B, C, or "status quo"), I strongly recommend that you implement version A. This would restore the area to its natural beauty, perhaps much more than what I enjoyed 30 years ago.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1688    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 00:26:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Why don't you people stay the hell out of Reynolds and Shannon Counties. Have any of you ever stopped to think that the local people once owned all of the properties making up the Ozark Senic Water ways. Many of the locals were duped into selling thier property, by a few locals working the Government. Had they know how it is now being run most of them would have not sold out.

Oh yes those trusted locals buying that land made a good profit for themselves. They also were alowed to aquire and keep parcels of that land located on the rivers.

Both of the rivers flood every year causing way more damage than the local boaters, atv and horseback riders can ever do the gravel bars and surrounding river bottom land.

Manage you cities, they have far worse problems than than any place on the Current or Jacks Fork rivers.

So far I have not heard of any drive or ride by shootings, muggings or rapes on the rivers, unlike your cities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1689    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 07:29:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Given the current issues (pun very much intended) of overcrowding, shootings associated with trespassers, people changing the oil of their ATV's in the middle of the river, horses defecating in the river and more, I would suggest option A.

I floated those rivers as a youth 25 years ago. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways has since become more crowded, misused and frankly mismanaged. There are far too many boaters; horses and ATV's are ruining the trails. As the name implies, the riverways should be scenic - - a place to connect with nature and the appreciate beauty of the rivers, not a place to come and worry about your personal safety and the safety of your kids,

I fully understand the need for economic development, but let's find a way to do so that doesn't spoil the very reason we come to these unique places. Preserve them for what they were originally intended - - a place to escape the crowds and stresses of everyday life and to appreciate the great outdoors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1690    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 07:30:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We support "Alternative C." We hope you will consider and involve the Back Country Horseman in your trail planning. Fewer miles of horse trails will put more impact on the trails that are already established. It would be more beneficial for the trails to loop instead of riding in and out on the same trail which puts greater impact on the trails.

We would like for the trails to be available for the future generations of equestrians.

If there is a fee for equine, will there be a fee for all users of the parks?

We have been involved in maintaining trails through the Show-Me Missouri Back Country Horseman organization by picking up trash, trimming trails, and placing trail markers along the equine trails in Missouri for several years.

Sincerely,

Larry and Linda Dishman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1691 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 08:00:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Re: Ozark Scenic Rivers / General Management Plan

I have done the best I can to read through the various options from the General Management Plan. I am glad to see that you have the foresight to address the various issues that are mushrooming within the park. My comments are as follows;

1. I am a wilderness advocate, but I do not see the value of having a postage stamp wilderness. I would prefer the resources be used elsewhere.
2. I think that vehicular access to the river itself needs to be limited. The current managed access points seem to be adequate to reach any portion of the river by watercraft or on foot.
3. Motorized watercraft usage also need to be eliminated in the smaller, upper reaches of the rivers, above Alley Springs on the Jacks Fork and above Akers on the Current. There is not enough water in those stretches to make motor craft usage safe to others using the rivers.
4. Horse usage should have limited access to the rivers as well as a buffer zone to allow animal waste to breakdown before entering the rivers. The safety and health aspects of these restrictions seem obvious.
5. It seems that an additional horse oriented campground would not be a threat as long as it was well insulated from direct access to the rivers or major tributaries.
- 6.. In general Alternative B seemed to cover the best options overall.
7. It seems that there is room for cross choices across alternative plans.

My usage is limited to the sections above Round Springs on the Current River and above Alley Springs on the Jack Fork River.

Mark Thalhammer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1692 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 08:09:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The maximum protection of this sliver of the Ozarks needs the greatest protection. I have floated both the Current and Jacks Fork rivers and know that continued degradation is inevitable if left unchecked. These are national lands for use by all U.S. citizens, not just the locals who have abused the area with little regard to

the long term effects of their actions. Therefore I would vote for Alternative A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1693    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 08:24:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I don't live in St. Louis but I think something need to be done about this.our planet is dying little by little our snow is melting our air is getting bad if we don't protect our planet where we live as a present for god who will?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1694    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 08:49:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom it May Concern:

I grew up in these hills. I learned to swim in the Jack's Fork River. I camped at Alley Spring when it was State owned and just last summer I camped with friends from Mississippi.

I still float, swim, canoe, sit by the side of and enjoy this wonderful riverways that I call home.

The management plan has always caused a stir. No one likes change, and change is extremely difficult when it is enforced by total strangers. I know it first hand because I married one of those strangers. I married a park ranger from Queens, New York, when he worked at Alley Springs. For many years I lived in Parks throughout our great Nation and saw the management of these lands. Somehow, someone has forgotten the real issue of what the land is to be used for. I believe it is for recreation (meaning enjoyment for our families...viewing wildlife, swimming, boating, sitting beside, picnicing, riding horses, walking, hiking, photographing, visiting loved ones burial places... the list is endless. In fact I have done all of these things during 2013.

The people in my town make a living supplying the needs of many visitors to our area. Shannon County is poor. Starved by a government that sends jobs out of the area and will barely hire anyone from the area. Shannon County is mostly owned by the Government and outsiders get profits from the timber sales. Even the timber goes to out of area harvesters.

Today I ask for common sense.

1. Return the park to a lovely status that we all enjoy going to visit. Even the animals do not visit Alley Springs anymore. I used to see all sorts of snakes, fish, turtles, frogs, eagles, deer, blue herons, muskrats, near the spring.
2. Return the Native American artifacts back to the Red Mill where they were excavated from 10-12 years ago. Not one display is located in the Red Mill to show where those arrow heads were dug from the base of the Mill.
3. Stop interfering with the people that make a living by intimidating visitors.
4. Do not close the Park again. Management is not even seen on a daily basis during winter months and when the Government shut down,it became illegal to see one of our Nations most beautiful Springs. What a disgrace to our tourists.

OUR Jack's Fork and Current rivers belong to everyone. Alley Mill and Springs are one of the most photographed places in Missouri. This is my home. My heritage, my culture and most of all the place I retreat to for peace and inner solace.

Thank you for listening.  
Respectfully,  
Tommye LaGrand

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1695    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 08:51:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The lack of effort by the National Park Services to protect the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSC) demonstrates great disregard for protecting this area of natural beauty that was once pristine. It is unacceptable that the neglect and lack of commitment on the part of ONSC has resulted in the rapid demise of this natural wonder robbing future generations of a natural heritage. I urge the National Park Service to take their commitment seriously, step up and take action to restore the ONSC to its former beauty.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1696 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 08:53:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I express my appreciation to the National Park Service for providing such a thorough analysis of the issues pertaining to the protection of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers in the Missouri Ozarks. Our family sometimes floats these rivers and enjoy them and the beauty of the surrounding area.

While both Alternative Plans provide protections for these areas, I submit my strong preference for Alternative Plan A because it provides GREATER protection for these rivers and the surrounding area. I urge you to select Alternative A as the most beneficial management plan for this wonderful national treasure that we have in the Missouri Ozarks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1697 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 09:31:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,

I would like to inform you of my support for Alternative Proposal A, Management.  
In lieu of that proposal, I would support Alternative Proposal B. I read Mr. Histon's comment in the recent Post Dispatch article and could not have agreed more.

Anita Moore

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1698 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 09:33:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,

I would like to inform you of my support for Alternative Proposal A, Management.  
In lieu of that proposal, I would support Alternative Proposal B.

Ruth Denton

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1699 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 09:34:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I lived in Shannon County, MO, from birth until HS graduation, and again in 1972-1975. I have experienced many happy float trips on the Jacks Fork & Current Rivers & Camping & other visits on their banks. I have since heard from local residents & Park Service employees of the degeneration of the rivers, most perpetrated by local concerns like the Trail Rides & irresponsible residents of the area. I definitely support Plan A with strong support for protection of the rivers. I don't think the local citizens or business concerns have the will or ability to do what is necessary and believe the Park Service is in the best position to correct the abuses.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1700 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 09:37:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic

Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1701    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 09:45:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As the presiding president of my organization I want to express our concerns about the management of these precious Missouri resources. Please adopt strict policies to keep the river conditions as undisturbed as possible.

Thank you,

Jack Ginnever  
President, Concerned Citizens for Crystal City

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1702    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 10:02:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Re: Ozark Scenic Rivers / General Management Plan

I have done the best I can to read through the various options from the General Management Plan. I am glad to see that you have the foresight to address the various issues that are mushrooming within the park. My comments are as follows;

1. I am a wilderness advocate, but I do not see the value of having a postage stamp wilderness. I would prefer the resources be used elsewhere.
2. I think that vehicular access to the river itself needs to be limited. The current managed access points seem to be adequate to reach any portion of the river by watercraft or on foot.
3. Motorized watercraft usage also need to be eliminated in the smaller, upper reaches of the rivers, above Alley Springs on the Jacks Fork and above Akers on the Current. There is not enough water in those stretches to make motor craft usage safe to others using the rivers.
4. Horse usage should have limited access to the rivers as well as a buffer zone to allow animal waste to breakdown before entering the rivers. The safety and health aspects of these restrictions seem obvious.
5. It seems that an additional horse oriented campground would not be a threat as long as it was well insulated from

direct access to the rivers or major tributaries.

6.. In general Alternative B seemed to cover the best options overall.

7. It seems that there is room for cross choices across alternative plans.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1703    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 10:07:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I first paddled the Scenic Riverways 30 years ago. The use has increased greatly since then and, along with that, the degradation of the waterways and surrounding area. It is only going to get worse as the amount of people using it increases. A new plan is needed that allows non-destructive use while protecting and restoring the waterways and the biodiversity contained within. That is why I endorse Alternative A as the proper plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1704    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 10:19:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would favor alternative B. Alternative C puts too much of the natural resources and natural beauty that makes this area so attractive at risk. I have great concerns that alternative C would cause even more of this unique part of the state and of the country to be "loved to death" and the natural resources that make it so attractive would be further degraded and destroyed in the process.

Though there are interests that may want even more access to provide even more economic impact in the area, they are reaching the point of "killing the goose that laid the golden egg" and destroying, from overuse and abuse, the very resources that make this area so attractive.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1705    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 10:27:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Cerulean Warbler | [Mdf/Wikimedia Commons](#)

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways-located within a globally significant Important Bird Area-provides vital habitat for hundreds of species of birds, including the Cerulean Warbler and the Swainson's Warbler.

Send a public comment to the National Park Service today and urge them to protect this critical habitat.

Take Action 

Dear Mary,

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is at the heart of the largest contiguous block of forest in the lower Midwest, and part of a globally significant Important Bird Area. But, decades of rampant proliferation of motor vehicles, motor boats, and horse trails on riverbanks, gravel bars, and throughout the waterways have resulted in erosion, sedimentation, pollution, and overcrowding-leading American Rivers to list the Ozark Riverways among its Ten Most Endangered Rivers in 2011.

Despite this degradation, powerful interests have prevented the National Park Service from improving the management of Riverways. The Park Service is proposing a new plan, and we have the opportunity to restore critical

areas of the Riverways' precious ecosystems. Audubon and our coalition partners support "Alternative B" for a balanced approach to managing public use while preserving and restoring critical habitat.1 It's critical that people throughout our state make their voices heard in support of the new plan!

Follow the steps below to submit a public comment directly to the National Park Service. The deadline to comment is February 7.

Go to the Park Service's comment page (will open in a new window).

Fill in your contact information.

Copy the sample letter below and paste it into the "Comments" section. Feel free to edit the comments with your own words about why protecting the Ozark Riverways is important to you.

**IMPORTANT:** Let us know you sent a comment. This is the only way we have of knowing how many people are sending letters.

Thank you for taking time to submit a public comment. Please help us spread the word by sharing this message using the "Share this alert" buttons below.

I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1706	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 10:28:44
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** I am a 61-year-old native Missourian who has kayaked the Current and Jack Fork rivers and hiked in the area for many years. I thank the NPS for working to preserve this area for present and future generations. I support Plan A because it goes the farthest to protect the rivers from overuse and degradation. Thank you for your efforts!

Martha Schmitt

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1707	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 10:31:36
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** Any plan should have as a priority preservation of the quality of our natural resources. Recreational use should be regulated with consequences of unfettered access considered so as not to compromise the priority of preservation.

---



**Correspondence ID:** 1708 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 10:40:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I cannot remember a time in my life when I did not float the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers. I was lucky enough to have parents who appreciated the sheer beauty of those cold, clear streams. My husband and I have carried on that tradition with our daughters, both of whom started floating at a very young age. Our love of the rivers was key in the family decision to buy property in Shannon County in 1999. In the next decade, my husband and I look forward to retiring in our Shannon County cabin. We have gotten to know and respect many locals, most of whom have very deep roots in the area. What to do with the park is everyone's concern. I greatly appreciate the careful studies made by the Park Service. My husband and I also attended an informational meeting at Powder Valley. After giving much time and attention to all three plans, I am a strong supporter of Plan A. I want future generations to experience the beauty of the Ozark Rivers. I also strongly favor making the area around Big Spring, one of the "Ozark Jewels," a wilderness area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1709 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 10:53:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am speaking as an 83 year old woman whose life span has been refreshed and illuminated by access to places like the pristine rivers and parks of Missouri and in many other areas of the country. They were and are a powerful asset and respite for a populace over-run by the crunch of industrialization and urbanization. We are a family of eight, and even in the early days of our camping trips on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, our forays into National Parks from Arizona to Maine, we were painfully aware of the misuse and over-reach of our fellow campers and land owners. When the National Park system took over the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. we were delighted- -hoping that new rules and regulations would prevent washing cars in the rivers, allowing horse trails to further pollute the waters, and canoe and moterboat mob scenes deface the sandbars and beaches.

Now, at last, there is a plan to meliorate such violations of river and park quality, and with the Sierra Club and other watchful environmental groups I ask that you decide on Plan A instead of B in the current considerations. There cannot be "too much" oversight in defense of the natural world. With fracking, oil fields and pipelines and all the problems contributing to climate change already negatively changing our world, the need for natural resources is abundantly clear. They must be- -for everyone- -a psychologically fruitful refuge and pleasure, an aid to the greening of our planet, and knowlege that urban "escapists" like my family (we are now 21) and rural residents can all canoe down the same rivers with the same mind-set- -one of appreciation for what we all share and the wisdom to keep it serene and safe for ourselves and future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1710 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 10:55:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Preserve the waterways! It's time to preserve the peace and quiet, the cleanliness of this pristine waterway (at least it was so the last time, five years ago, I floated the Current and camped on Sinkin Creek!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1711 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 11:24:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern:

This is my second comment, so if there is a limit, I guess you can disregard this.

Yesterday, my husband and I went trout fishing on the upper Current, at Parker ford and above. It was a gorgeous day, rainy, cold, windy, and full of solitude. We were completely alone, except the bald eagle, the songbirds, an armadillo, and a squirrel or two. The fishing wasn't great, but I'm not a very good brown trout fisherman anyway, I had a couple of strikes and two brownies up to my feet, which got off (a rainbow will hook itself on a fly and spinner, so I need to adjust setting my hook and tension on the fish to be more successful, but that is ok, my husband always pulls through as he fishes with lures, we brought home a nice brownie for fish tacos). If you are wondering what the point is.... I guess I haven't done a very good job, so I will literally spell it out: there is opportunity for solitude on the Current, it is a public place and we were alone for five hours. To me this speaks to the outcry of all

the Sierra Club members, etc. that decry the overuse and crowding on the river.

I have canoed, fished and walked the banks of the upper Current for forty years. From a first person point of view, the more permanent changes I have seen on a negative level have to do with invasive species, erosion of banks and eutrophication. Rainfall drains downhill, and because the complete watershed is not protected, a certain amount of all three of these can be expected. However, all three of these also have direct sources within the park. For the upper Current, the effluent from Montauk hatchery and nursery has a deleterious effect on the water quality, causing a minor, but undeniable, effect on algal growth and thus oxygen content of the waters. Horse traffic causes both bank erosion and is a direct source of invasive species and nutrient effluent through horse excrement. I have fished at Montauk, and owned and ridden horses for thirty years. It is not that I am against either of these, but I do see the adverse effect of both on the Current, and understand the responsibility of the concessioners (both State of Missouri and Whispering Pines) and patron to protect that environment which inevitably provides for their income and/or enjoyment. The hatchery needs a treatment pond, and shod horses need to be on roads that can be graded and are not directly in the flood plain (except at hard crossings).

No one can expect privacy on a sunny day in June on the Current, but everybody should expect that flagrant contributors to the decimation of the health of the environment can be controlled.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1712    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 11:33:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I recommend the No Action Alternative. I have several reasons but the main one is that there is enough governmental interference in our lives here without adding more. I have resided here for 20 years after moving here from 30 years in a state where everything short of the color of your trash can was regulated. We have been fighting the Federal goals of Sustainable Development, Agenda 21, the Wildlands Project, a United Nations Biosphere Reserve, Ecosystem management, a National Heritage Area, a Blueway scheme, etc. and now you want more interference through expansion of park management...no thank you. I am also well aware of the accusations of abusive behavior of Park Service personnel in the Ozarks preceding the past twenty years and those ill feelings are instilled in the locals through their families' experiences. Also, it appears that a National Trail is in the works, giving the Park Service personnel even more outreach. Let me see..had all of the above schemes succeeded, the feds would now be in charge of just about everything but the color of our trash cans.

Put my name down for the No Action Alternative, please.

Sincerely  
Wanda Benton

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1713    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 11:36:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** On behalf of Audubon Arkansas, state office of the National Audubon Society, I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) under Alternative B. Audubon Arkansas believes this alternative provides a reasonable balance between protecting the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Closing and restoring undesignated trails, while redirecting users to new designated trails and campgrounds, will protect habitat for forest interior nesting birds, which are sensitive to habitat fragmentation and human disturbance. Restoring and stabilizing forested riparian corridors, upland meadows, woodlands, and glades through prescribed fire and use of native plants will also protect bird species of conservation concern.

Audubon Arkansas appreciates its good working relationship with NPS in Arkansas. We are confident the NPS will make the right decision towards better management of a nationally significant natural resource in Missouri.

Sincerely,  
Dan Scheiman, Ph.D.  
Bird Conservation Director

Interim Executive Director

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1714 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 12:08:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My wife and I have floated on our Ozark streams many times in the past 40 years and feel like they have been badly compromised during that time in terms of environmental quality. Please enact stronger enforcement measures, please adopt Alternative A to ensure that these beautiful areas are protected for future generations and not degraded by those who want to use them in ways not consistent with good conservation practices.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1715 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 12:29:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** it is my view that the woods can/and should be used by all ! horses , motorbikes , people , hunters and fisherman

i have used our forest for many years [ i am 57 years young ]

when u restrict motorbikes and horses in small areas you will get some trail marks this is not what you want allow people to spread out in many areas

you have made it so restrictive that people have to leave the state just to ride

that is not helping missouri ! keep the money in missouri

missouri is such a pretty state and you can not see all of it by just walking

i miss it back in the 70's when you could ride in the forests picnic and camp all weekend ride trails with a map and compass

keep missouri open to all sports !

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1716 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 12:46:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service,

As a Missourian I am so happy to hear that you are turning much needed attention to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. This is a precious resource for all and especially those of us who use it regularly. Thank you for your analysis. While alternative B is a step forward, it does not target the protection of the rivers as alternative A would do. It is terribly disheartening for me to be out in the beauty of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, which I frequent several months of the year, and to have to watch the havoc wreaked on the wildlife and ecosystems due to the illegal road crossings. Please adopt alternative A which would close these illegal roads and restore the ecological integrity of these river systems.

I am also a very strong advocate for wilderness status designation for Big Spring. Again, I feel that this is a precious natural resource and fragile ecosystem that merits your protection.

I am deeply grateful for your study and hope that my words touch your heart as you move forward in this urgent and monumental decision. So much is at stake!

Sincerely,

Cheryl Lawler  
47 Aberdeen Place  
St. Louis, MO 63105  
314-566-9215

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1717 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 13:02:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

Sincerely,

Dan Reed  
1530 Timber Trail  
Jefferson City, MO 65109

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1718	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 13:12:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.				

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1719 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 13:15:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1720 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 13:16:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to see Alternative B implemented. It sure took a while but this alternative will help preserve what we still have and maybe heal some of what has been degraded. It's sure not the river I grew up knowing in the 1960's.

Thank you,  
Kevin Schrader

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1721 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 13:16:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas

of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1722    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 13:17:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1723    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 13:23:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I like the idea of a Management Plan. I prefer a balanced approach that would address the concerns of the people who actually use the park the most.

My biggest concern is access. Who determines "authorized" access. Here is a place for consensus building. A committee of concern parties should make these decisions. Example: Park officials, county commissioners, conservative group representatives and liberal groups representatives, and local folks.

The factors used to determine access should include traditional such as county roads, old logging roads, topographical maps, and trails.

I have used the park since 1976. My uses have been canoeing, hiking, horseback riding, hunting, fishing, swimming, and camping. As a young man I enjoyed cliff jumping.

Commercial use of the park by vendors of canoes, tubes, horses and such do need special rules and limitations. They should also share responsibility, through money or man power for added maintenance and up keep expenses.

I don't own a Quad runner or big motor boat so I can only say I respect their right to use of the park, but can easily see how abusive these machines can be especially in ever larger numbers. Young male craziness is probably where most abusive behavior comes in to play. Yet as we don't shut down the highway because someone speeds or litters we cannot shut down access to the river because of the abuses of a few.

The large trail rides (horses) present a special problem. Here again we shouldn't penalize local folks who like to ride horses throughout the park in small groups or as I have often done by myself.

I did not read the whole plan just the summary and stories in the paper.  
My hope is for a balanced approach, with special consideration to the local population who through proximity use the park more then others.

I look forward to more years of enjoyment and the same for my grandchildren.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1724    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 13:40:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir or Madam:

On Jan. 12 we commented on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan (ID: 884296-56208/674). We wish to add the following to our previous comments.

Thank you for organizing the recent series of public meetings. One of us (Tom) attended your excellent public meeting in Salem. We are even more convinced of the need for the most stringent regulations found only in Alternative A.

At your open house I met a woman who was organizing a caravan of boats and horse trailers to your public meeting in Powder Valley. She seemed to be totally against government regulation and seemed to feel that she had the Right to ride her horse anywhere she wanted. Indeed, if the St. Louis Post-Dispatch is to be believed, this caravan blocked access to the parking lot preventing others from attending the meeting (Doubts about the future of a national park in the Ozarks, [http://www.stltoday.com/news/local/metro/doubts-about-the-future-of-a-national-park-in-the/article\\_02722479-7801-5d45-83f1-10d2a3ea21e1.html](http://www.stltoday.com/news/local/metro/doubts-about-the-future-of-a-national-park-in-the/article_02722479-7801-5d45-83f1-10d2a3ea21e1.html)).

Nobody from St. Louis came to Salem and tried to prevent her from having her say. Why did she feel she had the right to go to St. Louis and prevent others from attending the public meeting there? As we remarked previously, people who behave this way should not be rewarded for their bad behavior.

We have seen time and time again that lack of effective government regulation leads to disastrous environmental degradation. To name just a few instances: Deepwater Horizon, Mayflower, Arkansas, Lac Megantic, Quebec and the most recent abomination, the toxic chemical spill in West Virginia that left hundreds of thousands without water and waterways degraded for many years to come.

Again, please choose alternative A. Ozark National Scenic Riverways needs the maximum protection feasible.

Yours sincerely,

Tom and Helen Sager

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1725    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 13:56:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to comment on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Draft General Management Plan.

For generations, the folks in this area have been good stewards of these rivers and we have taken good care of them. These rivers were originally given to the federal government to create the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, so that everyone would have access to the rivers. We just went through this last year when the National Park Service tried to pass that "Blueways" scam on us. How much longer is the National Park Service going to continue to try and shove this down our throats? Us old folks will continue to pursue every avenue we can to bring our rivers back under state control.

We can thank the National Park Service for destroying the fishing on the upper Jacks Fork River when they introduced Otters back into the river, just above the Buck Hollow Bridge. The NPS has already closed "Buck

Hollow Access" to the river and the Plan has not yet been approved.

I strongly recommend that my state and federal representatives support the No-Action Alternative to the Draft General Management Plan and work to bring our rivers back under state control.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1726 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 14:26:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in favor of strong protection of a that protects the resource. Restrict motorized vehicle and unauthorized vehicular access. Restrict horse traffic and maintain a controlled environment that protects the watershed from the waste products from horse usage. Restrict outboard motor sizes to appropriate areas where the river can tolerate or resist the prop wash and bank erosion. Also, power boats tend to disturb the serenity of the ecosystem.

If we fail to protect our resources now, there is no way to restore them later.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1727 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 14:42:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you National Park Service for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo. Nevertheless the Missouri Sierra Club believes Alternative B does not go far enough. It recommends the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:  
Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;  
Closes 65 miles of undesigned horse trails and adds no new stream crossings; and  
Bars vehicle access to gravel bars.  
I would like a wilderness status designation for Big Spring. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1728 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 14:44:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is a scenic river, for all public use,,an shutting down trail for horses in Shannon county will impact all tourist trade in all states around Mo.people come from TX.Iowa,Neb. Ok Mt. Ks.this will be hurting Shannon, Dent,Carter,all of Mo. will be affected by this movement. It takes a lot of fuel, pulling horse trailers, an campers just to visit the Ozark's  
This will be taking money from road taxes, an tax basis on all schools.Without tourism in Mo.We won't have schools, NPS wants people to come to explore this are, an see caves. They are all locked up. Steal gates and bars over the entrances,,Round springs cave was shut down all summer,an this is a major tourist attraction,people want to see other attractions. Like the Haunting of the Hills. This is for public use. The park are falling to pieces,Alleys springs looks neglected,, Big springs fields are all nasty,an brushy, next to the springs, its all growing up in brush,an thorn trees. Just like alone the rivers,, look at Alley park,, falling in the river on two loops.Take away boat an motors,who will save the tourist with broken arms,an legs.LOCAL BOATERS.You never see rangers on the river. If you want to take 40/60jet boats we will go to 40 props. Than see what happens to the eco.system. Locals haven't seen the NPS do any thing for us. CBR #5733518805

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1729 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 14:47:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It is so important that we take care of our entire environment and ensure it stays or becomes healthy. Our most precious resource is water and I urge the decision makers to keep that as a primary focus as they make decisions regarding land and water use.

To often big business defines how our resources are used (and frequently they are abused) and this needs to change



so that the future direction is directed by what is best for the environment.

Please listen to us. Thank-you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1730    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 14:51:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to state my objections to the alternative B gravel bar access plan. I am a senior citizen that enjoys going to the river, sitting on the bank and watching my grandson and his friends swim fish and play in the water. Several of us parents and grandparents go as a group. We take chairs, coolers, air mattresses etc. for us and the kids to use. I was born and raised on these rivers and know a lot of small bars that we can go to and not be constantly bothered by other people. We cannot carry all of the things we need very far. I don't see any reason for you to take this privilege from us.

In my group of friends that does this four of us men served in Viet Nam and one was wounded in the leg bad enough that he has problems walking. I have a condition caused by being there that has affected my stamina so much that I can't carry anything very far. We don't want to have to go to an area that you designate that everyone else is at. They have different things that they enjoy and we would none be able to have the experiences that we have in the past.

All I hear these days are this Park is for everyone. Don't forget the seniors. Limiting gravel bar access is one of the worst things you could do to us. All the floaters could still use any place they wanted to but we couldn't. We are the ones that pay taxes here, serve on the school board, clean the roads out when trees have fallen in them, and help people that get in trouble on the river and hundreds of other things. Think about those things when you are making a decision.

For one thing, you leave yourself a blanket slate by saying that the number of gravel bars accessible to vehicles would be designated and reduced. That could mean one or all. I don't think anyone believes that it would only be a few. If you can't name the ones that you believe are a problem, then you shouldn't be given the power to close any. I also like to use some of these areas to put in a small boat or canoe for fishing. I may only want to fish a hole or two and don't want to have to put in miles away and motor to and from these spots. In fact, a lot of these places on the Jacks Fork can't be motored to because of low water conditions in the summer months. I also like to drive there and wade and fish a few holes or just fish from the bank.

Another use that you would be taking from me is the method that I use while turkey hunting. I drive to some of these areas, put on waders and go to the other side to get to good hunting areas that are not accessible from the other bank. As far as all the destruction our driving up close to the river is causing, I've been watching this river for 68 years and the floods take care of a few vehicle tracks. They do more damage to the banks, roads, trees, gravel bars and fields than all the people do and you can't legislate the weather.

In my humble opinion, if you would use some of the money that it would take to hire all these rangers to enforce these new regulations that you are proposing, and start putting river cleanup crews back on the river like we had in the past, the rivers would be a much more enjoyable place to visit for everyone. If you would go gigging some of these clear winter nights I think you be disgusted, like I am, at all the cans and trash in the pockets just below the shoals. Some of which looks like it has been there for years.

As with all my other comments, I would like to end by voting for the NO-ACTION alternative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1731    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 15:04:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Fed Park Service Needs to not change, or shut down/ no more roads on Currant/Jacks Fork river ways. Leave all trails, and roads alone, my kids and grandkids might like to ride horses, some day...Evan UTVs, 4 wheelers.. let us make our own decisions on our own county roads., Not the people in ST.Louis or the Park Ranges. This land belonged to locals before the state of mo, and the park service owned it. If you can't take care of it right {Sell it back to the State of Mo.} Hire more locals 12 month a year, we need jobs at home too. Call me 5732265543 anytime. DNR have work groups for young adults. Why can't the park service?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1732    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 15:10:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to comment on the ONSR, Draft General Management Plan.

The proposed changes in this Draft General Management Plan will affect nearly every aspect of this beautiful scenic riverway. The closing of 20 access points will prevent local folks from floating, fishing and canoeing our local streams. The proposed changes will be devastating to this area. I would like to see the Ozark National Scenic Riverways be returned to the Missouri Department of Conservation and our Missouri Department of Natural Resources. Our State Park Division is in a much better position to maintain and operate the Scenic Riverways. They are in a much better position to consider the needs of the local people and better understand our local economy.

I strongly recommend that my state and federal representatives support the No-Action Alternative to the Draft General Management Plan and work to bring our rivers back under state control.

Attached is a picture showing how the National Park Service is already closing access to the Jacks Fork River. Picture taken at Buck Hollow access on 01/30/2014

Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1733    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 15:38:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to state my opposition to your preferred alternative B on gravel bar camping. I have camped on both the Jacks Fork and Current rivers all my life. Limiting camping on primitive gravel bars to designated sites only would be very restrictive to our Ozark way of life. It doesn't seem fair for the canoe users to get to camp anywhere they please just because they are floating. As a senior citizen, it is very important to me to be able to drive close to where I like to camp.

I have no desire to camp in your designated areas with all the young floaters who like to party all night. I was here when this wasn't a Park and well remember the promises made that it was to be a recreational area and not a Nat'l Park like Yellowstone. We were promised that our traditional ways of hunting, fishing, camping and enjoying the river would be upheld. This has not been this parks policy since the beginning. It has always been a struggle to keep our roads open. It seems every few years someone decides that several of them should be closed for one reason or another...

What benefit it would be to the park to close gravel bar camping is not easily understood. You can camp on some of those bars that you want to close now all year long and may never see a ranger. How do you propose to enforce all these new regulations when you don't have the budget to mow the grass, pick up trash or clean the bathrooms now? Of all the new proposals that you have come up with, I don't see any that was made to benefit the local residents. It seems like it is the parks position that the tourists and sierra club members are the only ones considered. What happened to "A place for all the people."

I understand that we can't go back to what it was before the park, and for one I wouldn't want to.

I believe this is a much better place to live and enjoy the rivers than it would have been without the park. You can look in the four mile areas and see what all the private land would have been like.

But I also believe that it should be left alone as things are going pretty good for the most part as it is.

The motorboat and canoe issue is as good as it has ever been the horsepower limits are acceptable by the majority of visitors, so why keep trying to impose new regulations at every opportunity?

For all the above reasons I vote; No- action.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1734    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 15:59:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** What is needed are designated trails that make loops which would minimize traffic and provide more enjoyment. Also, fewer trails could mean overuse of the ones that are designated if you close too many trails. Horses also need access to the river, because of their need for drinking water during the hot summer months. Very important to consider the needs of horse riders and the economic impact to Missouri and the Ozark Riverway area if the good trails are closed and horse camps are forced out of business.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1735    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 16:44:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1736    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 17:07:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I agree wholeheartedly with the NPS plan. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is at risk of being abused by both locals and outsiders. It is, as one person has noted, a national park, not a local playground. Locals may argue they depend on tourism to make a living, but if they cannot be good stewards in partnership with the NPS, then they will have to learn with tighter restrictions. Please keep the ONSR from being abused.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1737    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 17:15:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the restriction of using power boats, ATVs and other motorized devices on the rivers. I have been harassed by jet boaters while canoeing on the Current River and consider the noise and disruption that they cause incompatible with the peaceful use of the river and the park. They not only ruin what should be an idyllic experience but are degrading the ecosystem. I think it would also be reasonable to restrict the number of boaters on the rivers each day to avoid the overcrowding and noise that sometimes happens on weekends.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1738    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 17:40:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Suggestion A is far preferable to any of the others for reasons of protection of the environment and the removable of power boats from the areas usually used for floating and camping.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1739    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 17:52:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I

prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1740    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 17:56:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I read most of this document and believe that Alternative B is a reasonable and acceptable compromise between the maintaining as natural a state as possible in this park and increasing motorized access and commercial opportunities. As an avid hiker, backpacker, wildlife preservationist and naturalist I would like to see the park strictly limit motorized access of all kinds, as both will cause damage to shorelines, disrupt the fish and other wildlife populations and provide wilderness access to people who are more likely to disrespect and abuse the natural areas. However, if motorized boats or ATVs access and use is clearly defined and limited, and impacts are monitored, it would provide enjoyment of the area for all kinds of recreation and people with a variety of interests. My main concern is that if you open the door too wide, then before you know it, rules will loosen or Federal law enforcement will look the other way or be unable to adequately patrol the non motor areas and ATVs and motor boats will be plowing through natural areas indiscriminately and causing damage. And given federal budget cuts, patrolling and managing a wild life area is labor intensive and expensive to fund. So is it realistic to expect that enough manpower and support will be available in the near or farther future to monitor increased access to the public?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1741    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 18:10:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I think it is very good. It is too important to secure, protect and provide for our future animals and humans. This is a good start to a program to protect the water and wildlife. Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1742    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 18:23:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**  
Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for the time and work put into this effort. The rivers of Missouri need to be protected from overuse and carelessness. Please adopt Alternative A. We can enjoy our rivers without destroying them at the same time.

Please give Big Spring wilderness status.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1743    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 18:39:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support a strong management plan for the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. I would like to cast my vote for Alternative A as it supports the best protection for the rivers.

Thank you for taking time to consider my comments.

Carole L. Riesenberger

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1744 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 18:46:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** One of my major issues is the possibility of more access points for horses to drink at, by or in the water. I understand that horse riders want to have more areas on the rivers where they can water their horses. This may sound like a reasonable idea unless you have hiked where horses have torn up trails. I have hiked and backpacked on the Ozark Trail. I have built and maintain parts of the Ozark Trail. The number of horse owners who respect the trail seems to be low. The number of horse owners who have helped build or maintain trail is even smaller. The facts are there to support me. Horse riders educating each other would help and getting involved in building and maintaining trails would be an eye opener for the horse folks. I'm not against the horses but the inconsiderate owners.

Speaking of horse power. Boat motors with less horsepower is important. Environmental degradation can be seen occurring as the waves hit shorelines. Increased silt can also be a problem. Safety is a factor. Being in a canoe as a speeding boat goes by is a safety issue.

ATV abuse of the rivers is routine. More law enforcement officers could curb this problem.

All in all a few more restrictions might be beneficial. The plan with the most restrictions is excessive and undoubtedly will have opposition from the many folks who use the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1745 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 18:59:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to see Alternative A adopted. I'm in favor of the least disturbance of natural areas, and the most restoration of abused land. Natural habitat is only getting more scarce. Its preservation is our responsibility to other species that live there.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1746 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 19:07:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We are opposed to the NPS taking over more land in our county and imposing more regulations on our rivers! (WE THE PEOPLE, are supposed to have a say in our government policies). For one thing we won't be getting tax money that is needed for survival. We live here and want to keep our rivers for all to use not just the tourist. We enjoy it daily and they only occasionally. But with more restrictions tourist won't want to come, thus we loose tourist money for our small towns. No doubt tourists like it as is, and not cluttered with more regulations. Our rivers are filling up with gravel, since we are not allowed to get sand and gravel out of them. Thus not much water any more as years ago like I can remember. Leave things alone and let the rivers run free so we can enjoy their pure clear water and a nice place to take a swim in the summer months and have a family picnic on the gravel bars!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1747 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 19:22:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Alternative A, because the areas in question cannot withstand any of the other alternatives. These areas are beautiful and natural and there are not enough of this kind of land left. Because of this, the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers need to be protected and not allowed to have mechanized recreation take place on or around them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1748 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 19:30:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Illegal roads, misuse by ATVs, and excessive horse traffic are all taking their toll on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, home of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. Therefore, I support a strong management plan for the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. The National Park Service (NPS) recently released their Draft General

Management Plan for the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, which includes various alternatives for park management. I advocate Alternative A as it offers the strongest protections for the rivers. Alternative A helps save the rivers through the following:

- it closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads
- it closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings
- it bars vehicle access to gravel bars

I also advocate for wilderness status designation for Big Spring

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1749    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 19:31:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please take into consideration the value these river ways bring to the communities that surround them. I have canoed and kayaked both these rivers for 15 years. I have also been a part of the trail riding community for two weeks each year for 12 years. I am 56 years old and my husband and I just spent the weekend in Eminence. Mo enjoying the river and the national park to view the fall foliage. It would bring complete devastation to these little Missouri towns who are struggling even now to survive. I have seen the wild mustangs crossing the river and it was truly a gift from God to see animals in their natural habitat. Please don't take this away from Missourians ! What will be the purpose of this much land in government control if no one comes to use it or see it. I understand trying to preserve it but surely we can find a happy medium for all involved. There are very few places where horseback riders can ride for a week and cover this many miles of trails, for me it was like a slice of heaven being able to get away from the rat race of life. I have met people from all over the United States who every year come here to ride. There have been many who have fallen in love with this area and even moved here. During all my visits I have always stayed in cabins, motels and shopped and eaten in the local communities who depend on these different recreations to put food on their table for their family and teach them the lesson of hard work. Please please consider the ramifications this will have on these families and what if your family was from a small town in southern Missouri where choices of employment were limited. Thank You ! Karen Lee

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1750    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 19:39:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Our organization, Audubon Society of Central Arkansas, has discussed the options for managing ONSR and support Alternative B. We support Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects

This area is a treasure for our state and nation. Americans for generations to come should have the opportunity to enjoy this area. We are grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

Thank you, Jane Gulley

President, Audubon Society of Central Arkansas

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1751    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 20:17:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** After review of the action plans, I support No Action Being Taken. Implement and fund existing management plans.

Change will impact in a negative way the local economy and restrict usage of horseback riders.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1752 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 20:18:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a Missouri native and active outdoors-woman, the Ozark waterways hold a special place in my heart. Please adopt Alternative A to protect the Current and Jack Forks Rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1753 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 20:23:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to share my concerns about the new GMP for the upper part of the Ozark National Scenic Riverway. I feel that having a number of good horse trails that lead you through the beautiful part of the riverways is very important. There needs to be several trails that lead to the Current River from the camping area. If there are not enough trails, then there is a possibility of them being overused and possibly cause damage to the park. This beautiful country was intended to be enjoyed and that can be done by having several trails for the horseback riders to enjoy. If you will provide the trails, the horse people will be very willing to help maintain them.  
Thanks for your time and being willing to share the park with the horseback riders and others.

My vote is to follow proposal number 3.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1754 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 20:32:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alternate A. My family and I have been on Jacks Fork and the Current Rivers many times in a canoe.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1755 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 20:35:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service,  
I have spent many hours on the Current & Jacks Fork rivers, both before it was protected & after. The change was dramatic and my family has been please by your thoughtful analysis for the future. We all support adopting Alternative A to protect these wonderful rivers and access to them. Please also give wilderness status designation for Big Spring. We appreciate your consideration for our future.  
Thanks,  
Kay Duchek

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1756 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 22:02:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** hello I would like to start by saying I love the rivers the way they are. but year after year I hear how they want to control them more and more. and its not just wanting they do. you cant hardly float any more without being pull aside and messed with. tease rivers have always done just fine without the over controlling of them and you cant say that they are polluted because when you test them it is usually when there has been a lot of floaters in it. so that not the real reading. the real reading is after a flood because god has a way of taking care of things. I don't believe this management is about helping the rivers .I think this is about trying to take away freedoms that many generation have got to enjoy. but if you control them the next generation wont.no offence to the park service. I respect what there suppose to do and they have done good for years. but trying to control it more makes no since. my grandpa and grandma loved these rivers and my great grandparents did to. if you watch the old Shannon county home videos my great grandparent are in them the cutts family . and I have more my grandma was raised on jerktail I have a family cemetery down there that I tend to. to bunches and youngbloods . all im saying is if you need help cleaning up some trash . I and many people I know would love to help clean and help. in fact we have been on a

few stream teams . all we want in return is to leave the rivers the way they are there is no reason to try and fix something that's not broken. unless you plan on breaking it and this plan will break it. this town and many more will die. and without the towns thin there will be no wear for the people that come to see your rivers to stay or eat or do any thing .so if you rely want to protect it protect it don't try and control it. it didn't get to be a river bye controlling it. a river flows wear it wants to . so please let us be like the river .

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1757 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 03:16:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I feel that the water crossing issues need to be looked at. The plan as a whole would ruin the tourist economy for some counties that are in dire straights already. This area draws a lot of out state tourists. I have friends from Wisconsin that take two week vacation to come here. Their spending for the two weeks is approximately \$3,000.00 .The loss of this type revenue times thousands would be a disaster. EXTREME caution is advised.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1758 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 04:05:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1759 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 05:08:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We'll I liked both A and B versions . I don't mind the boats so much if they would slow down some and let a canoe pass before going on. Smaller engines would be nice. You do not need 5 people in a boat buzzing around drinking beer with small children in the boat. Need more hiking trails like down on the Buffalo. Very nice trails. Stay by the river , go up creeks. Not just dry old ridges. Have trails on both sides of both rivers , cross the river in so low areas. More history would be wonderful. Get rid of 4 wheelers, give them to the law only. More education on not littering and proper bathroom training on the river and forest, nothing worst than toilet paper everywhere. Hope all goes well. Now start on the upper Gasconade and slow the boats down. Very nice up here, too many cows in river though.

Thanks much. Mike

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1760 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 07:06:46



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Alternative A is crucial. Protecting vehicle access is crucial to protecting the water-life, turbidity and health of the streams and rivers. For Missouri, this is a heritage that should not be thrown away and it is an economic factor in local and non-local tourism. Vote for Alternative A of ONSR. I volunteer to test 2 streams in Springfield MO and monitor their health. I do my part, please do yours.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1761 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 07:18:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have floated and camped on/near these rivers for my entire life and very much want to see them preserved for my grandchildren. Please enact plan A.

Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1762 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 08:04:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We feel that the regulations that are in place now on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways are sufficient to protect the rivers in the park. Many people living in this area depend on tourism and recreation for their income. Imposing more restrictions on the use of the park would severely damage their livelihood. The local residents appreciate and love the riverways. They are not going to do things to damage their source of income. They know better how to take care of the rivers than the bureaucrats that live in Washington D.C. or someone else who lives a few hundred or thousand miles away from the river. It is sad that there are some people who have an opinion that there is a serious problem with the rivers and the only way to solve it is to impose more restrictions on the use of the rivers. It is just ridiculous to put more limits on the recreational use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1763 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 08:11:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1764 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 08:24:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support alternative A to protect the Current and Jacks Fork rivers.

Thank You,

James R. Walker

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1765 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 08:35:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My fondest memories from childhood always include our family's annual pilgrimage to the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers. The pristine waters, abundant wildlife, and unparalleled scenery are second-to-none in the Midwest. That said, I worry for the future of this very delicate ecosystem; specifically - I worry about the impact the more recent developments along the rivers has had on what I consider an Eden-like place.

I recognize that the rivers are a huge source of revenue for the region, and it is not my intention to judge others for pursuing a better livelihood. However, I don't believe it is worthwhile to sacrifice the abundance and splendor available in the Ozarks for the purpose of limited economic development.

I would like to think our children would thank us for keeping these increasingly rare "wild" spaces free of development and intrusion by equestrians.

Thank you for your consideration,

Mike Othic

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1766 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 08:36:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I thank the National Park Service for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo.

Nevertheless the Missouri Sierra Club believes Alternative B does not go far enough. I agree with their recommendation to adopt Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:

Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;

closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings; and bars vehicle access to gravel bars.

I also support wilderness status designation for Big Spring. Members of my family have floated the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers every year since 1980. We rent multiple canoes from outfitters and usually buy snacks or forgotten items while in the area. We have taken many out-of-state friends to float Missouri's clear rivers.

It is hard to restore natural habitat and easy to destroy it. My grandchildren deserve natural areas to explore with their families.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1767 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 08:47:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The bird diversity of the National Forest is an essential indicator of forest health. Birding is also a growing recreational interest in the region. Protecting rare birds is an essential role of forest stewardship. As we identify habitat needed for their survival, we also protect less charismatic plants, insects, and amphibians.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1768 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 08:53:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I applaud efforts to revise and implement a new management plan for this very special area, as it is evident that the park has seen its share of degradation. The thoughtful analysis and varied management plans are appreciated, and even the advocacy for Alternative B would be a major improvement. However, I believe that Alternative A would be far superior in protecting the degraded communities within the park, and reducing harmful recreation that is damaging and equally repulsive for those seeking the original integrity of the area. I believe that a tourist economy can be maintained through promoting low-impact and less crowded exploration of quality ecosystems, even increasing its desirability amongst genuine enthusiasts.

I also support wilderness designation for Big Spring, and protection that would ensue.

As a local resident and enthusiast of the area, I have found it troubling to see a federally protected area so degraded by tourism- through volume of people, horse trails, obscene jet boat use leading to erosion on banks, and general trash from unregulated use and access. I hope to see major changes soon, and be able to experience a fragment of the Ozarks left undisturbed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1769    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 08:59:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Ozark National Scenic Riverways  
404 Watercress Dr.  
P.O. Box 490  
Van Buren, MO 63965

RE: Comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan (GMP)

Dear Superintendent:

I'm writing to share my comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan (GMP). I prefer Alternative B as outlined in the Draft General Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement. Specifically, my experience in the Riverways in the following recreational uses include fishing, hiking, and canoeing. These uses are important to me because of the incredible beauty and environmental importance of this region.

In addition, I appreciate the conservation and preservation functions of the National Park because the preservation and protection of the watershed of the ONSR affects the health of this ecosystem and that of the larger systems to which it connects.

The 'No Action' alternative is unacceptable to me because it fails to address the need for more enforcement of existing laws and standards, to better manage overcrowding, and to improve communication and partnership with local landowners and communities. Further, it fails to address these critical problems in the Riverways:

erosion from all terrain vehicles and horses

bacteria levels

increased levels of recreational use involving horses, boats, and ATV's

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways ('Riverways'), established on August 17, 1964, encompasses 134 miles of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. The Riverways' enabling act has three stated purposes: preservation, conservation, and recreation. As Missouri's largest National Park, it showcases several world-class freshwater springs, caves, and bluffs that are home to fish, birds, rare and endangered native amphibians, crawfish, and plants. It is a testament to Missouri's commitment to conservation that the Riverways is a National Park and was the nation's first National River.

The Current River and Jacks Fork are prime recreational waters in a stunning natural karst area that attracts approximately 1.5 million visitors each year. A 2011 study estimated visitor spending at more than \$55 million with nearly 90 percent of spending from non-local visitors. As a unit of the National Park System, management of the Riverways must ensure protection of the Park's resources in an unimpaired condition for public recreation, education, and scientific value. Among its tasks is sustaining and restoring bio-diversity for the next generation. The management of ONSR-in terms of resource preservation, sustainable use management, and restoration of natural ecosystems-should rival that of our nation's most pristine and unique public lands.

Yours truly,

Steve Crock  
4 Forrester Dr  
Manchester, MO 63011

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1770    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 09:05:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We are at a time of crisis caring for our mother earth.....please follow Alternative A in caring for the current river and our beautiful state of Missouri....each small step counts.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1771 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 09:11:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Though my gut says that plan A is the best for the national forest, I think plan B is the most practical option for all concerned. It has some compromises in it, even if everyone does not agree that they are there. B on the Draft Management Plan would be my vote.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1772 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 09:20:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please save our natural resources, wilderness parks, clean water, animal and bird life.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1773 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 09:27:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for allowing comments on this issue. Heavy ATV use, horse traffic and excessive motor boat use is damaging the OSNR. We must do all we can to protect our water ways. If we are allowed to continue to over use and abuse the rivers, the erosion and toxins in the river will make them unsuitable for recreation in the future. I strongly recommend choosing Alternative A for the strongest protection possible.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1774 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 09:27:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As every thinking human knows Fresh Water resources are, next to the air we breath, essential for sustaining all life on this planet. Our country has too long allowed our fresh water treasures from the Great Lakes to our rivers and streams to be trashed and polluted.

With regard to protecting the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Option "A" or at a very minimum Option "B" needs to be implemented and the sooner the better.

No one wants to put an end to recreational use of our forests, open lands, or waterways but we must educate our citizens on the proper use of these resources in the 21st Century.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1775 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 09:38:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would agree that Option B seems to be the most balanced of the options for the management. However I do consider the "size" of the boats as well as the horsepower to be an issue. Jon boats, like my grandfather owned were narrow, not as large as they are now. And even though I enjoy gigging, the sound of huge generators do make a big noise for others. I do want my children and grand children able to use a clear clean river. I would hope that you all would find some way to protect the cemetery areas. One I went to last year was run over by ATV's. I feel that they should be completely banned from the riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1776 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 09:56:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please continue caring for the Current and Jack's Fork rivers. I have many wonderful memories of canoeing on the Current and both are area treasures which should always be preserved. While your plans are a good start, I encourage you to adapt Plan A, which would be even more helpful in limiting the vehicle and horse traffic pollution.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1777 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 10:03:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please select Plan A. Preservation of this natural resource should be the pre-eminent guiding factor in your decision. Permitting destructive uses is not consistent with a long term goal of preserving this public space. The area has suffered from essentially unregulated use and is in decline as a result. The local people have been unwilling or unable to stop the destructive uses that threaten this area. Therefore, it is very important that you adopt the plan that will provide the most protection for the natural environment in order to preserve these rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1778 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 10:21:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hi,

First of all, I want to thank the National Park Service and any and all state agencies, NGOs, non-profits, businesses and ordinary citizens who took part in this study. I downloaded the 500 page study and while I admit that I did not read the whole thing, I recognize all the hard work and careful thought that went into making it. More than anything, I appreciate that the whole process was done with great transparency and opportunity for public input. WOW, imagine that!!!! Real democracy in action!!

I just wanted to say in regards to the proposed management plans put forth, I am in full support of stringent guidelines to restore the health of these streams, the only real estate in Missouri preserved as a National Park (outside of the Gateway Arch, which is NOT a natural treasure). I am approaching 50 years old and can vividly remember these streams being much cleaner when I was a kid floating and swimming in them. I would like to see them restored to their full health.

I believe the single biggest contributor to the current state of poor water quality is allow motorized boats to go up and down these rivers. Second to that is all the road crossings. Then come all the ATVs and horses.

I do not believe National Parks should be treated or run as commercial playgrounds for activities that tear up the natural landscape or waterways. I am not against hunting, floating with non motorized boats, fishing, camping, hiking.

My main complaint is with motorized boats.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1779 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 10:29:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Alternative B as a realistic compromise that will most likely garner the buy-in of local businesses, which is important and necessary, and of many if not most of the local, reasonable residents of the area.

In the 40 years of canoeing and enjoying the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers, I've noticed an increasing degradation of the rivers and their banks as more and more users frequent the area and more and more users treat the area as if their parents will arrive later in the day to clean up after their messy and unruly children. I don't know what can be done about this, but I know that other long-time users like me avoid the rivers on weekends and Mondays. We find that the period from late Fall through early Spring is the best time for enjoying the rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1780 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 10:34:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Re: Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan

I have canoed on both the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. They are beautiful natural treasures.

Without being too wordy, Alternate B (also favored by the NPS) makes sense. Doing nothing would be nuts. Alternative A would probably entail much more debate. The NPS can always ramp up the oversight if Alternative B doesn't work. But we can't quickly undo more damage if the NPS takes no action.

Sincerely,

James E. Bryan  
Fenton, MO

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1781 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 10:41:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the A rules that have been put forward. My family owned a cabin at Ebb & Flow camp since the early 1900's and I spent many weeks each summer enjoying the camp, and the peaceful river. After the riverways took over it has been a different story. The river has become a three ring circus. I am 76 years old and I remember how it was many years ago and it should be returned to that state. Get rid of the motorcycles, ATV's and the horses crossing and swimming in the river. This was not a problem when I was enjoying the pristine area. The Shannon Hunting & Fishing Club is still a viable organization that believes in keeping the land as the Wilderness that it was many years ago. If the Park service is going to take over something and claim to keep it as a wilderness area they need to keep their word.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1782 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 10:46:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,  
My choice for the GMP for the Ozark Nat'l Scenic Riverways is ALTERNATIVE A. It is selfish for riders of horses and Motorized vehicles to degrade the natural beauty of the ONSR just for their personal pleasure. Habitat destruction worldwide is exploding, and it needs to be slowed in every way possible. Please think for the long term and preserve this natural treasure.  
Dr. Lynne Breakstone

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1783 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 10:53:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have live on the Current River. Our family owned land from the sixties until a few years ago. The land was sold to the Forest Service. I have seen many changes over the years. The biggest change is the number of motorized vehicles and their size. These really impact my experience in ONSR because of the noise. The water was drinkable at one time, and our springs were clean. The NPS must step up to the responsibility of properly managing the park and protecting it from over use by locals and tourists. Many National Parks in our nation limit visitors and charge fees to preserve the delicate ecosystem and beauty. I support charging fees to floaters, campers, trail riders etc. if that's what it takes to protect and properly maintain the ONSR. I support prohibiting boats above Round Spring during May thru October. I support closing trails to prevent driving to gravel bars and setting up camps on the edge of the water. I support keeping trail riders away from the rivers and preventing crossings. People who live in Eminence and Van Buren seem to believe that unrestricted use of the ONSR by tourists is their way to a better life through a better economy...more people, more jobs. The rivers are not to be exploited for a few but protected for the future. I support Plan A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1784 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 11:05:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Our family have been land owners of a 160 acre section located in the Current River watershed since 1966. We have used our place many for recreation and relaxation. We have also floated the Current River many times over the years and are intimately aware of the the subject area. With this background I would like to say that of the four alternatives, Alternative C is the one I would endorse at this time. I understand the river usage issues but am undecided on the need to convert large tracts of land to a Wilderness designation such as proposed in Alternative A and B. Thank you for allowing me to comment.

Sincerely,

George Mellicker

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1785    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 11:09:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to see horses given the same right to enjoy the riverways and trails as the hikers and the bikers. This country was founded with people on horseback. They were our way of transportation and work for many years. This land belongs to us as citizens and we should be allowed to see it in any form that we choose. Is there some that are inconsiderate? Yes but that is in all groups. I would also like to see several designated trails so it cuts down on erosion due to the fact that the horses aren't forced to travel the same trail all the time. I vote for alternative C. It has been my experience as a horse person, that most of us are more than willing to go out and clean up trails, pick up trash or whatever is required of us to keep our trails. Missouri is a gorgeous state and even better from the back of a horse!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1786    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 11:24:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** All sensitive environments within the NPS must be protected from detrimental human actions to ensure their preservation. I support the Alternative B approach if it will prohibit illegal horse and ATV activity and the encroachment of all types of inappropriate accesses that disturb the natural shores of the rivers.

Please acknowledge receipt of this comment to wjne kola@yahoo.com

Thank you,  
John Nekola  
St. Louis, MO  
314-457-9936

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1787    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 11:30:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you in advance for allowing me to comment on behalf of the Missouri Trappers Association. It concerns me about the recent proposals of the (GMP) draft. From what I understand, these proposals would impose new horsepower restrictions on motor boats and banning motorized watercraft on much of the riverway, close approximately 55 miles of access roads, close approximately 20 river access points, closing approximately 65 miles of trails, putting a cap on the number of people partaking in various recreational activities, and implementing possible permit systems on horseback riders and motor boat users, and the most ridiculous of all, requiring to have a permit to perform Baptisms.

Since its establishment in 1964, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways has been a place of tourism, canoeing, motorboating, horseback riding, fishing, hunting, and trapping. Implementing these proposals is not only further infringing on our "taxpayers" rights and putting unnecessary, burdensome laws and restrictions on a resource that is owned by the American people, but will also negatively affect management of the local wildlife, tourism, and also will affect the economy.

In closing, I oppose all these proposals. They are all unnecessary and will impose on all hunting, fishing, trapping, camping, horseback riding, tourism, and the economy. I feel if any further infringing rights are imposed on this matter, my grandchildren will not get to enjoy the full potential our National Parks have to offer.

Sincerely,  
Robert Page  
President  
Missouri Trappers Association

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1788    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:02:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Growing up in Shannon County you do not realize what unique and rare rivers we have had the opportunity to live around until you leave the area. I went to college and traveled through many states playing volleyball. We passed over several rivers and creeks in many states. None of the creeks or rivers could compare to Current or Jacks Fork. Many of my friends came and floated the rivers over our college years. Today nearly twenty five years later several of them bring their families to camp and float.

The comments that I have heard is that the locals destroy the land and rivers. Just the opposite happens. We pick up the trash left behind on gravel bars by campers. We pick up trash out of the rivers. We do not own the river but we have just as much right to have access to it as anyone. My fondest memories was taking vacation on the river. Most families in the area could not afford to take a vacation so we camped at the river for a week. Several families get together and all the kids. I have been camping every year with my kids on Current River. The new layout at Broadfoot's only has four camping spots, which doesn't have enough room for all of our friends. The funny thing was the head guy at Round Springs came down one day while my husband was at camp and ask what could be done to make it a better camping site. He said nothing needed to be changed, everyone he had talked to was happy. Some people from Mtn View used to camp and ride horses and now they will not have enough room either. This redesign of the camp ground happened when the park did not have enough money to remove the trash from several canoe put in and take out areas. But some how had funding for four separate concrete grill pit areas and lantern poles.

I see Sinking Creek is going to be blocked off and will have day pedestrians. So the tradition of camping is gone. What is wrong with camping on a gravel bar? Most people floating by does not thinks it disturbs the beauty.

Everyone loves to watch the movie Shannon County that shows a way of life that is unique to most everyone in the nation. We are labeled, "Hillbillies". Which in some ways we are because there are certain cultures and traditions that we pride ourselves in passing on generation after generation. This plan threaten the tradition of gigging, primitive camping with friends and family and access of motor boats in areas except after labor day. I vote no action.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1789    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:06:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect the Ozarks - the Rivers & Eco-system. It is part of my life. I treasure it. Thanks for all you can do. Blessings, Jean in Little Rock

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1790    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:06:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please help preserve what is left of the important waterways in southern Missouri. Redirecting some recreational activities to areas where damage is minimized, establishing levels of use that keep the rivers cleaner, and allowing damaged areas to heal are the keys to stewardship of the Ozark Riverways. And this can be done while adding to the local economy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1791    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:07:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Property rights are one thing, but something as fluid as a river needs environmental protection. Our Current and Jacks Fork rivers are incredibly unique, special to our region, and a lot is riding on maintaining their safety and viability in the future by preserving them so people will still want to- - no, so they'll still be ABLE to enjoy them as they have. I'm in favor of limiting or preventing motor-based vehicles and boats on the river, which pollute the streams with chemicals and noise, and endanger the wildlife which is necessary to attract more tourism dollars. We should take advantage of this opportunity to protect the river for ALL, not just for property owners or rip-it-up vendors who are only interested in "what's in it for me, me, me." It's ironic to me, that we live in one of the prettiest places in the country, and it's littered with trash, disrespected by "patriotic Americans," and we completely rip it apart to indulge our "recreational choices". It's disgusting to me that "wonderful fellow Missourians" can dump whatever waste they want to on their own property, hollering "property rights! no one tells ME what to do" the whole time, while they pollute everyone's groundwater and the crap flows or blows over to the next property. And



the state of Missouri CANNOT and WILL NOT oversee the rivers, too many fields and streams have become casualties due to state politics and/or underfunding monitoring efforts. I back the preservation plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1792    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:08:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation ofâ€the Current River and Jacks Fork Riverâ€its free-flowing streamsâ€springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1793    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation ofâ€the Current River and Jacks Fork Riverâ€its free-flowing streamsâ€springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of

the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1794	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 12:11:28				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	ANYONE THAT HAS FLOATED THE MO. RIVERWAYS <3 :)KNOWS THAT THEY'RE VERY SPECIAL PLACES <3 :)				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1795	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 12:13:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	NPS,				

I am writing to thank NPS for your analysis, it is thoughtful and well done.

I am also writing in support of alternative "A." I support of alternative A because it closes illegal roads, closes 65 miles of undesignated horse trails, and bars vehicle access from gravel bars.

Thank you

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1796	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Black:				

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964)

I am convinced that it is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of

the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1797	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Black:				

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation ofâ€the Current River and Jacks Fork Riverâ€its free-flowing streamsâ€springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs,

representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1798    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:17:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** "Missouri Sierra Club recommends the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers." I agree, and would go even further by banning motorized watercraft on all stretches of scenic riverways. These rivers are scenic because they are largely pristine- they stay that way only if the boat floats with the water and does not churn and bespoil it with noise and oily residue.

"The Park Service should recommend that Congress designate Big Spring Wilderness." I agree. Springs like Big Spring should be come upon as if each person visiting made the discovery...inasmuch as possible we can come close to offering such an experience if we make any adulteration of the area as difficult as possible. A Wilderness designation will do that. A great spring is a wonder that originates from a pure and mysterious source; when it deigns to show itself to mortals the viewing must be held with some reverence, and it must be earned (certainly not sped to and glanced at through glass while the engine idles).

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1799    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:19:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please manage the park for its natural and recreational values. Our waterways are some of the best in the nation. Keep them that way.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1800    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation ofâ€the Current River and Jacks Fork Riverâ€its free-flowing streamsâ€springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.
- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.
- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.
- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.
- Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs,

representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1801    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1802    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:25:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do what is necessary to not only continue to protect the Ozark Scenic Riverways Park but to do it better. This unique country is where my family and I spent much of our childhood and there is no other area like it. Stop worrying about the urban areas and take care of our natural resources. When they are gone, they will never be recoverable!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1803    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:28:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

Sincerely,  
Kathy Turner

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1804	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Black:				

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as

described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1805	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 12:37:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Black:				

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

Sincerely,Douglas Berg

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1806    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:39:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Many Ozark Rivers are in danger of losing their important recreational and economic benefits to the citizens of this area because they are poorly managed and protected. Like all valuable national resources it must be protected. Please join with NPS to study how we might better preserve this very wonderful river for future generations to admire and use for recreation and natural beauty.

David Hightower  
Cordova , TN

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1807    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:40:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** National Park Service

Thank you for your detailed management draft plans concerning the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Current and Jack's fork rivers.

The population of the United States continues to grow. The United States now holds the dubious title of 3rd most populous country in the world.

The ability to step away from all the negative ramifications that this title bestows is extremely important and getting more so with each passing year.

I would like to see ALTERNATE A chosen as the management plan for this important area.

Once an area is turned into a de facto 'Disney Land' it is difficult if not impossible to recover its original character.

Commerce can always move to less sensitive areas away from these treasured places.

Thank you,

Bob Hagg

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1808    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:40:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No fracking or pipelines here !

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1809    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:41:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of...the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.



-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

Sincerely,  
David Jones

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1810    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:42:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Black,

The GMP that exists currently does not give adequate protection to the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers. We have seen this through the frequent river-crossing of horse trails, the damages brought about by ATV use, and the large horsepower allowance of jet boats on high, narrow stretches of river.

The health of the resource should always be held as the highest priority. The limit of recreation should be at the point where its purposes conflict with the ecological integrity of the resource itself.

Whether A or B, I hope you will consider changes to the GMP with respect to the rivers' preservation for future generations in mind.

Matt Whitaker

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1811    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:45:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We need to keep the rivers clean & safe for all to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1812    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:49:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Common sense regulations protecting the river and it's water shed from degradation should not be difficult to assess. Once in place the rules of area use should be enforced to their fullest.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1813    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:54:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1814    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:55:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alternative B

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1815    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:56:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I, as a part of Audubon and our coalition partners, support "Alternative B" for a balanced approach to managing public use while preserving and restoring critical habitat.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1816    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and

enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.
- The Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal (60/40 rule) so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.
- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.
- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. These roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.
- Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1817	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 12:59:37				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.
- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.
- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.
- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.
- Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30

years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

Sincerely,

Ellen M. Mitchell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1818    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 13:06:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.
- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.
- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.
- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.
- Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

Sincerely,  
Peggy Smith

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1819    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 13:09:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have my own canoe and enjoy floating and fishing. The rivers belong to all of us. Both those who live nearby and those like me who come from a distance. Our rivers are our gift and we have a responsibility to take care of them. Four wheelers don't belong in the rivers. They can and probably do harm the gravel bars, so some limits should be put on them. I'm sure the local people want to use their motor boats to go upstream to their fishing spots. I personally hate them. They are loud, many go so fast as they pass by I fear being swamped. No wake regulations would make it safer for those of us in canoes and would cut down somewhat on the noise. Horse crossings need to be limited to reduce the amount of feces in the water. I understand that there are new trails proposed for horses that would lead to that end.

Keep our rivers clean!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1820    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.
- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.
- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.
- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.
- Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1821    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 13:16:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "... preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B. -The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways. -To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas. -The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored. -Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

Sincerely,

Lynn McClure Sr. Director, Midwest Region

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1822	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 13:18:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I grew up nigh the Jacks Fork River and spent ample time there as I was younger. I have since moved away after enlisting in the Army and follow on employment, but my kin yet habituate the area and I still consider the region home, and always will. Every time I come home, I go to the River. When the Feds took the Rivers in the 60s, there was endless consternation amongst the natives, needless to say. But I aver it has turned to the best in the long run.

I record my old Granddaddy, Ed Weaver of the Birch Tree area, telling me of the times when the REA and Corps of Engineers were conspiring to dam the River and the efforts to forestall and defeat the measure. He mentioned that turning the tide against the dams was probably the single most significant accomplishment of Governor Forrest Smith's administration.

I have read with interest the proposed Alternatives as set forth by the Parks. I fully understand that the Park is for everyone, but my abiding concern is of where the "locals" come into consideration and if any consideration has been directed to their desires. I spent several years in defense of assorted vacation spots as Kosovo, Iraq, Bosnia y Herzegovina and others, so needless to say I'll not dawdle in my defense of home.

While there is considerable population and pressure from outlanders to the River, it is still visited and enjoyed by

quite a batch of folks who live there. To completely ban motors on the Upper Jacks Fork is only impinging on those that live there. Granted, during the dry there will not be a great amount of motorized travel on the Upper Jacks Fork. In all my time on the river, I rarely saw anybody not from there utilizing a john boat and motor that was not from nearby. So what is the alternative? The status quo seems a tad untenable, since that form of operation has brought us to this tipping point. Other than the boat motor restrictions on the up river areas, Alternative B seems 'middle of the road' enough to assuage a few and aggravate the majority out at the extremes. I appreciate Alternative C in that it would impact the least those who rely on the River to produce their livelihoods, but we have to keep the future well in mind lest we 'herd the hogs to a sorry waller'. I absolutely disagree with curtailing camping on the gravel bars. If 'primitive camping' includes setting up camp on an attractive stretch of bank while floating or motoring, then that is a non-issue (Ozark National Scenic Riverways, 2013, p. 40).

An amalgamation of the Alternatives may seem like fence straddling, but I feel it is the best alternative. Keep the boat motor limits as is. Reduce the time and effort wasted on the management zoning and completely forego the learning center alternative, while encouraging the Youth Ranger programs at the volunteer level along with the 'Friends of' program. Continue efforts to strengthen the horse program to include increasing authorized trails while decreasing and ultimately doing away with the unauthorized trails. Increase bike accessibility and use while curtailing ATVs plundering the gravel bars. And ALWAYS honor your contracts and agreements with the outfitters and other concessioners. While on the cover, we have what amounts to four alternatives, but the individual tenets within each are at times restrictive and relays a 'them or us' sentiment. Folks in the Courtois Hills and Ozarks are generally pretty friendly, but if it comes to 'us'n agin' them others', they will generally side with us'n.

We have an abundance of opportunity here and it's appreciated the Park's personnel has at least taken a lick at coming up with a solution, but I will not gainsay the attempt to apparently forego any consideration of them that's from there. It'd be better to re-visit the construction of the alternatives now. Because, needless to say, if WE choose wrong now it will only result in having to 'set on a blister' for the next "15 or 20 years" (ONSR, 2013) years.

Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). (2013). Draft general management plan/Environmental impact study. Retrieved from <http://www.parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID=158&projectID=15793&documentID=56208> on 3 February 2014

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1823	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 13:20:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Black:				

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

Sincerely,  
Mike Oglesby

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1824    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1825    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 13:27:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This is such a beautiful and historical area that it should remain in it's natural state. It is close enough to urban areas that many young people first introduction to wild area is the Ozarks. I hope you do your very best to help keep it that way. Thank you for reading my concerns.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1826    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 13:29:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This area is a treasure and MUST be protected!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1827    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 13:32:30



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** protect this waterway

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1828 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 13:39:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of...the Current River and Jacks Fork Riverâ€s free-flowing streamsâ€springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

Sincerely,

Cathy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1829 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 13:40:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Precious resource must be protected.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1830 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 13:43:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I hope we can pursue a relatively inclusive but ultimately conservative and conserving policy. Overall, I feel the Park system has done a good job in managing the scenic rivers and balancing diverse interests.

However, I believe some uses, especially in excess, are ultimately destructive of the rivers' long-term health. The uses that concern me the most involve extensive vehicular access (including power boats), extensive and un-policed equine access, and excessive canoe rental operations. Although there are other pressures that concern me, these three all hold potential for problems such as sound pollution, damage such as erosion and overcrowding that ultimately degrades or even kills the "scenic rivers" that we sought to preserve.

In general, I probably lean toward something between Alternatives A and B. I believe the ultimate goal should be keeping the national riverways as natural and primitive as possible, but I also recognize the need for diverse use for political, economic and even equitability factors.

However, access that causes damage-even the erosion from a steel-shod, 1,200 pound horse-needs to be minimized. Regulations limiting the size of riding groups, efforts to limit horse trails to less fragile areas and other steps could help a great deal.

I feel more strongly about boat horsepower limits. I have witnessed unsafe and disturbing uses by relatively high-powered boats. Being an experienced fisherman, I see no reason for these rivers to be subject to craft that are basically designed for open, artificial reservoirs. Sound/noise regulations are difficult to enforce but would help maintain the quality of these areas. I would vote for elimination of power boats but, since that may be impractical, would support regulations limiting horsepower, speed, etc. as much as possible

I noted several comments have called for more access points but, if my experience is a clue, that will not work.

Seasonal and day-use solutions do strike me as having potential benefit.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1831	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 13:50:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Black:				

I often kayak, canoe and hike along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and would like to give my comments for improving the waterway.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

Thanks for allowing people to comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1832    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 13:51:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation ofâ€the Current River and Jacks Fork Riverâ€its free-flowing streamsâ€springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.
- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.
- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.
- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.
- Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1833    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 13:53:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sirs,

I appreciate the National Park Service's interest in our wonderful Missouri waterways and its concern about the abuse they have suffered.

I am in favor of the Sierra Club's stance of closing illegal roads, undesignated horse trails and unauthorized stream crossings.

Wildlife and stream dwellers cannot survive the degradation of stream banks and silting of the rivers.

I am in favor of Wilderness status for Big Spring.

Respectfully,

Jeanne Clauson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1834    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 13:53:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to see a map of the area we are concerned about. Ozark scenic don't tell me where we talking about Thanks D. Robert Du Be'

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1835    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

Please take these recommendations seriously. If the present conditions continue unchecked the damage will be irreversible. Please don't allow this to happen. Once the damage is done, it's forever.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River its free-flowing streams its springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessionaires and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1836    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 14:02:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Protect the Ozark National Scenic Rivers .

They are Beautiful & pristine.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1837    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 14:04:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep these waterways clean.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1838    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1839    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 14:14:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Stop putting roads in parks. That almost defeats the purpose of a park.  
They should be for our leisure and pleasure and a safe haven for animals.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1840    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 14:15:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of...the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service

to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

This river system is just north of where I live and part of one of closer recreational areas.

Sincerely,  
Jean Smith

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1841    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 14:18:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The rivers belong to every one !

They need to be protected for all of us and future generations.

If we destroy our rivers, we destroy ourselves. Clean water is needed for our very existence.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1842    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 14:18:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1843	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Black:				

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30

years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1844    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 14:22:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The original content of this correspondence has been deleted as requested by the attributed author

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1845    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 14:28:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
I support Alternative B(NPS Preferred). I believe it would provide a framework for reasonable compromise in updating the overall management direction for the Riverways.

Congratulations on a clearly organized, well written draft plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1846    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 14:33:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for allowing the public to comment on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan/Wilderness Study/EIS. The National Park Service's mission is to provide the public with a safe environment that enhances the wilderness experience. Allowing off road vehicles, expanding equestrian and firearms hunting opportunities is not compatible with providing the public with a safe environment.

I support Alternative B (the preferred alternative). I believe there could also be some improvements to this alternative that could strengthen the plan including the following:

⌘ Scenic Easements: Although there are no changes to scenic easements proposed in this plan there are 9,257 acres of scenic easements that are intended to maintain the natural environment and scenery for the benefit of the visiting public. These easements are critical to the quality of the Riverways. They were acquired to add public's experience of the national park and need to be effectively monitored in a timely manner and easement violations must be promptly corrected.

⌘ Wilderness: The review includes one small, undeveloped backcountry/wildland area of approximately 3400 acres near Big Spring. The area, which was acquired as a state park in the 1920s and later became part of the ONSR, has been continually managed as an undeveloped wild area and I support keeping this area wild without NPS management interventions. The Big Spring Wild Area should be recommended for federal wilderness designation.

⌘ Horsepower limit: Zoning for horsepower limits has been part of existing regulations since the River Use Management Plan of 1989. I support the balanced approach of motor-free zones for upper sections of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers.

⌘ Hiking Trails: There are so few hiking trails in this park and the additional miles provided in each alternative. The Park Service needs to provide more low impact recreational opportunities. Perhaps the NPS could partner with agencies and citizen groups to expand hiking trails.

⌘ Horse Campground: A horse campground with 25 sites is proposed for alternatives B and C. Instead of a new development of this magnitude, we ask that NPS work with existing local businesses to provide a concession horse camping operation outside the park that would have less impact on park resources within the narrow river corridor.



â€ Natural and Cultural Resource Management: I strongly supports the protection, restoration, and interpretation of natural landscapes, archaeological sites, historic structures, and cultural landscapes as discussed in this plan. Restoring and stabilizing forested riparian corridors should be emphasized. There should be no new conversions of bottomland riparian forests to open fields, and artificial pasture for elk and other wildlife.

â€ Annual Visitation and Economic Influence: Visitation is about 1.3-1.5 million each year. A 2011 study estimated visitor spending at \$55,445,000 and more than 88 percent of this spending is from non-local visitors. This spending combined with NPS employment accounted for 845 jobs, or 16 percent of total employment in Shannon and Carter counties. I support high-value investment in the Ozark region of south-central Missouri, understanding that a well-managed park and the visitors it attracts may be the most important contributors to the long-term economic health of local communities.

The idea of turning over the ONSR to the State of Missouri is absurd! Some citizens and politicians are not aware that this would take an act of Congress. Please do not consider this proposal.

The NPS has a responsibility to protect the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for future generations. Please consider my comments in making your final decision.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1847 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 14:34:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Clean the bacteria from The Ozarks. The politicians have been lying about for years.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1848 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 14:34:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have canoed the Current River for over 30 years and have enjoyed most of the experiences immensely. My trips have always involved no more than one other person, as the solitude and beauty of the river is what I wanted to experience. However there were several times that the trips were marred by an overflow of people and canoes even though it was in the Fall of the year or on a week day. There have been groups of thirty or more canoers that "invaded" my gravel bar campsite on two different occasions( Pulltite to Round Springs). I have had to endure the drone of an electric generators powering a banks of halogen floodlights at 2:00 AM from fish giggers boats at Bee Bluff. I also had the pleasure of having five men on horseback show up in my campsite at 6:30 AM (also at Bee Bluff). As a whole the people who use the river are polite and respectful, but I have never seen a ranger on the river. Because of these past experiences I no longer canoe the lower Current River. I have confined my trips to the upper portion that is more shallow and less prone to large numbers of people and motorized boats. I made the mistake of taking my son and his friends camping at the Pulltite campground about four years ago in July and the experience felt more like a Day at Six Flags Amusement Park than communing with nature.( An battle ship size RV complete with running air conditioner was allowed to park on a site that should have been reserved for tents). Too much of anything is a bad thing. Too many people allowed to do whatever they feel like doing in the name of an outdoor experience is the " Bad thing" that is going to destroy the beauty of the Current River. Hopefully additional regulations regarding how many people and how they can experience the Current River will save it for future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1849 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 14:38:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation ofâ€the Current River and Jacks Fork Riverâ€its free-flowing streamsâ€springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

Sincerely,  
Bruce D Burleigh

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1850	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 14:39:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Sample message/comments				

Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points

restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

Sincerely,

Fred Rathbun

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1851	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 14:41:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My son and I have canoed on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers in SW Missouri and we realize what a wonderful treasure they are. I would hope that they can remain protected by every means possible.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1852	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Black:				

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides

opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1853    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 14:53:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** concerning the jet boat restrictions, the rivers are self regulating and with the current regulations the jet boats provide much needed rescue for the other floaters. on the jacks fork about one half of my jet boat trips there is some type of canoe rescue involved. on the current river above two rivers patrol on summer weekends is needed to get the jet boaters to respect the right away of the non motorized boats which also need to be encouraged to turn in(state registration number} the jet boats that show a lack of respect for them. please do not let a few of the disrespectful jet boat operators ruin for the reat of them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1854    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation ofâ€the Current River and Jacks Fork Riverâ€its free-flowing streamsâ€springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations. National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1855    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation ofâ€the Current River and Jacks Fork Riverâ€its free-flowing streamsâ€springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service

to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1856	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 15:11:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Please protect our wilderness areas. I have been floating these rivers for over 40 years, and the changes up to now have been bad enough. This area needs to be maintained as it is for future generations to enjoy.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1857	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 15:27:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** concerning the horseback riding in the park.....below eminence we have witnessed a huge amount of disrespect by the "CROSS COUNTRY TRAIL RIDERS" towards the river and the other users. illegal trails and river crossings as well as equestrians lingering in the river is epidemic in the park as well as above it. for years the park and the mdc has posted signs and distributed literature in the try to encourage trail etiquette to no avail. they need to be permitted to ride in the park with visible permit numbers (on their saddles) so they can be held accountable for their actions. the same for atv's and utv's. Other users should be encouraged to take pictures of the violators when they see them where they should not be. The precedence has already been set for this with the jet boats and rental canoes and other boats. An over night camping area for equestrians would only add to the horse problems on the rivers with even more enforcement needed in an already troubled area. in eminence during a summer weekend when their is a trail ride the canoe rental's are down and the room vacancies are up because of this dirty and unruly crowd. most people here don't get in the jacks fork river when there is a trail ride.....

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1858	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 15:37:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** As an active rock climber and supporter of the National Parks Service, I wanted to comment

how the language in this proposal effectively bans rock climbing in this area. This is a wonderful climbing spot in Missouri, and I would hate to see it shut down and made off limits to climbers. Climbing is one of the major attractions for me to travel around the state of Missouri and explore the natural preserves, nature areas and state parks. I believe it is completely in line with the goals of the park service.

One of the stated reasons for this in the plan seems to be the danger that falling rocks might in danger guests below. This is the opposite of my experience, most of the time Rock climbers do not pull down rock, and in properly maintained climbing area's if a rock were to begin coming loose, climbers (or maintenance personnel) could remove it when there are not visitors or guests below. In fact, if the rock face is not maintained and used regularly, I believe the risk increases for falling rock. Allowing an area open to climbing effectively maintains that area to be free of falling rock, because when a rock were to begin to come loose, the climbers would be the first to be aware of it, rather than have one unknowingly come loose and hit someone unsuspecting below.

In general, Rock climbers are respectful of the land and the earth, and strive to go the extra mile to care for the spaces that we use to climb.

I encourage you to reconsider adding those restrictions to the final plan.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1859	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 15:39:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.
- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.
- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.
- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.
- Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1860    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Here in Randolph County, five beautiful rivers flow out of the Ozarks providing our drinking water, agricultural water, and a vital tourism industry. Their survival as clean, available streams is very significant to us.

We urge you to protect these watersheds to ensure that life here is possible. Particular concerns are lead mining, sewage treatment, agricultural and industrial runoff, construction of vacation homes along the rivers, and construction of earthen dams along the river tributaries.

Please keep these concerns in mind when enforcing and preparing laws for river protection in our region.

Bill Carrol  
president,  
Five Rivers Historic Preservation, Inc.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1861    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.
- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.
- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.
- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.
- Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Growing up on Current River, I've seen how things are changing. Motorboats with large motors are not only endangering the ecology of the river but also endangering human lives. In recent years I've observed several fiberglass racing boats, 400 horsepower shoal runners, and boats with outboard motors exceeding 150 horse power on the stretch of current river that passes my family's farm. Boats of these size do not belong on a river like the Current. They are damaging shore lines and muddying the river. My grandfather, who has lived on this farm his entire life, tells me of how the river was full of fish and you could see the river bottom even in sections of the river that were more than 15ft deep. That is no longer the case.

I know that this specific area is out of the protected area but I believe that the motor restriction should be extended to the remaining portion of the river. This would not only assist in the overall health of the river but also help protect rivergoers from boats that are to large for this river.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1862	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Black:				

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation ofâ€the Current River and Jacks Fork Riverâ€its free-flowing streamsâ€springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.
- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.
- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.
- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.
- Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1863	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 16:29:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

I am opposed to the NPS imposing more regulations on our rivers! (WE THE PEOPLE, we are guaranteed by the constitution to have a say in our government policies). We locals live here and want to keep our rivers for ALL to use not just the tourist. We enjoy it daily and they only on weekends and vacation. But with more restrictions tourist won't even want to come, thus we loose tourist money for our small towns. Tourists like it as is, and not cluttered



with more regulations. There is not much water in the rivers any more as I can remember years ago. We want them left alone so they can run free so we can enjoy their pure clear water, and have a nice place to take a swim in the summer months and have a family picnic on the gravel bars!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1864    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 16:36:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Alternative A is the best choice in my opinion.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1865    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 16:43:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As someone who has canoed the Eleven Point, Current, and Buffalo Rivers, I can attest to the beauty of the Ozark Region (and in IL I have canoed the Cache River and camped at Garden of the Gods) These rivers and region deserve protection!!!!~

Please help preserve this spectacular region for future generations!

Lynn Smith,  
Historic Pullman District, Chicago

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1866    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 16:48:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please, please, please do all you can to protect and restore the rivers of the Ozarks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1867    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 16:51:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Members of my family spend a lot of time fishing the scenic waterways of Arkansas. Some even come from out of state to do so. Our waterways need to be kept as natural as possible with harm from man mitigated as much as possible.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1868    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 16:51:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep the waterways opens! Please!!  
Thank you !!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1869    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 17:00:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am not going to speak to each specific detail, but am going to give my support to the overall plan to more tightly manage the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. As a user of these natural resources, I want to make sure that they are properly managed so that I will be able to use and enjoy these beautiful rivers for many years to come. In addition, I want to leave this park in excellent condition for future generations.

I understand that achieving this goal might change or restrict my access. I am also aware that this might change or restrict the way other people access these rivers. If we want to be able to use these rivers and pass them along to our children, these changes are necessary, even if it is at our own inconvenience. As an angler I am aware every time I wade out into the water to fish that I have a responsibility to myself and others to respect the resources, abide by the rules, and do everything within my power to leave the river as I found it, or in better condition. These resources were not put here solely for my personal convenience. Access is not license.

Although I am a Missouri resident, I know that these resources belong to the entire nation. To think that I have a special right to abuse these resources because they are in my backyard would be arrogant, selfish, and misguided.

Degrading water quality, eroding banks, and destroying stream beds are unacceptable. Those behaviors are not recreation - they are vandalism. Responsibility comes with access. These rivers are precious, fragile treasures that deserve our protection. Please ensure that the new management plan is implemented and strictly enforced.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1870 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 17:05:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I floated all the rivers at one or another, when I wore younger man clothes, as a canoe guide for the Boy Scouts of America and volunteered with Clean Steam. They were beautiful, serene, peaceful and quite so you could hear, see and feel mother nature all around you. We as an organizations kept these streams and banks clean. I have a place in my body, mind and sole for those yesterday. So try if is at all possible to continue the picture I have in minds eye.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1871 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 17:05:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the adoption of Plan A. To close down non-official road access will do a lot to reduce the trash that is left behind by day users going to party. These day users come with load music, food and drink waste and ATVs. I would go further to require horse riding groups to put diapers on their horses. This would greatly reduce to spiking pollution levels that are directly linked to horse manure.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1872 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 17:16:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Scenic Rivers is a National Park, thus it is for the benefit of all citizens and not only the wishes of the local citizens. In Missouri we have many streams that can be and are used for activities such as ATV usage that are not compatable to a healthy stream. Thus, as the Current and Jack's Fork are unique in their character, I recommend that the National Park Service protect these unique areas with the least amount of human intrusion. Thus, I opt for Option A for the plans for the park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1873 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 17:22:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In the 1960's I worked at Big Spring on the Current River, as Park Naturalist, from 1964 into 1968 before it became apart of the NPS. I have over the years, came to be very concerned about the way the general public has not paid respect to the river and the area around the river. From damage I have seen from either too many horses or horsemen who just don't care, to atv people who really don't care either and at times too many people floating and getting drunk and making a mess for other foaters. It is time for stronger regulations to be in place with higher punishments for those who violate those regulations and now is the time to act as things are not getting better very fast.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1874 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation ofâ€the Current River and Jacks Fork Riverâ€its free-flowing streamsâ€springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1875    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 17:39:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to give my support to option A. I would cite as evidence in favor of this option the ways development has affected Lake of The Ozarks. It is most certainly no longer a child or family friendly place, judged by the number of citations for drinking and power boating. It is no longer clean because of all the traffic on the lake and around it. Finally, having boated there once recently, because of the motorized traffic, it is not safe. Parts of the Ozark National Scenic River already resemble it. I think that from a perspective of family-friendliness, safety, and stewardship of our already stressed natural resources, option A is the preferred option.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1876    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams, springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I

strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

As a resident of "The Natural State" [Arkansas], I treasure the natural beauty of the Ozark National Scenic Riverway. As a long-time user of our National Park system, I treasure the diversity of our parks. By protecting this unique place now, we provide a legacy for our children and grandchildren that can never be duplicated.

Thank you for taking these comments seriously.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1877	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 17:49:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please protect the Ozark National Scenic Riverways! Limit motor horsepower, horse and livestock use, ban ATV's and anything else that could harm the important ecosystems. Thank you and God Bless!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1878	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 17:55:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support Alternative B in the proposed plan for the Ozark Scenic Riverway. This precious resource must have better protection than it is now receiving. In the best of circumstances, I would go for full wilderness protection but that would put too much of a burden on the local population; thus Alternative B is the best solution.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1879	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Black:				

---

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

- Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I

strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1880    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 18:01:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please leave the rivers in Missouri to the Missourians. This is not up to the Federal Government. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1881    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.
- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.
- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.
- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.
- Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

As a visitor to the area (I took my family here years ago for vacation), I appreciate the beauty of the wildlife and the rivers and waterways. Please take steps to preserve this for future generations.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Courter

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1882    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation ofâ€the Current River and Jacks Fork Riverâ€its free-flowing streamsâ€springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1883    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 18:12:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please manage the park for its natural and recreational values. Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1884    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 18:21:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't destroy our parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1885    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 18:24:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alternative B! It limits public use in fragile areas, while at the same time, allow the uses that are the most desired in a managed way. A new visitor center that can help orient visitors to the natural resources of the site could have a positive impact on environmental stewardship.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1886    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.
- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.
- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.
- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.
- Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1887 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 18:53:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir or Madam,

I have loved the Current River for fifty years. It was my family vacation spot for a decade. We camped, floated, fished and swan (even skinny dipped!!) in its pristine waters.

I know that there are people that live closer to it than I do (those lucky ones) and they feel more ownership than I. And do not let that deter you from preserving this wonder for my children.

Please do not allow motorized vehicles on the banks besides the established boat ramps. Please do not allow horses to foul the water from trail rides. Provide the horses water at a distance from the river that will not cause unsafe bacterial levels. Please do not allow floaters to endanger themselves or others through the excess use of drugs or alcohol, just as the state patrol would not allow an impaired driver.

I know also that the pressure to allow these things is strong. Hold fast for the generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1888 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1889	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 19:11:06				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support Option B. The Ozarks need maximum protection to retain endangered and threatened wildlife and no one can do it but you.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1890	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 19:16:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I'll never forget the night on a float trip when I was camped on the bank above the Jack's Fork River when a swarm of four wheel vehicles came roaring through the campsite. What a shock that this pristine, natural environment would be violated by mechanical madness. It is important that the State of Missouri provide adequate areas, such as St. Joe State Park, where people who want to enjoy the thrill of riding four wheelers can do so without disturbing the natural tranquility of pristine Ozark woodlands and fragile river and stream ecosystems. Let's keep the two groups separate so that we can all enjoy what we like best about Missouri.				

Over the years I have had the opportunity to enjoy many of the environments protected by the National Park Service, from kayaking in the San Juan Island National Historical Park to the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore to exploring Acadia National Park. What strikes me about all of the lands in our National Park system is how well we protect them from encroachment and abuse. The fact that only one of the Apostle Islands allows motor vehicles and the others are restricted to low impact camping, in the midst of high impact sport fishing, is an example how two different interests - - kayakers and power boaters - - can both enjoy this rich environment without jeopardizing the interests of either group.

I would strongly urge you to adopt Alternative A to provide maximum protection to this rare gem of a natural resource in the heart of our country.



---

**Correspondence ID:** 1891    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 19:22:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
Ozark National Scenic Riverways Feb. 3, 2014  
404 Watercress Dr.  
P.O. Box 490  
Van Buren, MO 63965

RE: Comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan (GMP)

Dear Superintendent:

Please accept these, my comments, on the Riverways Draft GMP. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways ('Riverways'), established on August 17, 1964, encompasses 134 miles of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. The Riverways' enabling act has three stated purposes: preservation, conservation, and recreation. As Missouri's largest National Park, it showcases several world-class freshwater springs, caves and bluffs that are home to fish, birds, rare and endangered native amphibians, crawfish, and plants.

For me, the Riverways is the most valuable place on earth. Nowhere else have I ever seen springs as deep and blue, rivers as clear and clean, or fresh waters as alive with fish. It is where I know everyone will fall in love with the Ozarks. I have seen less of the Riverways than I want, too. So far Big Springs and the Upper Current have been the extent of my exploration. As a unit of the National Park System, management of the Riverways must ensure protection of the Park's resources in an unimpaired condition for public recreation, education, and scientific value.

Therefore, I urge the NPS to adopt an updated General Management Plan that addresses new pressures on the park since 1984. I prefer Alternative B, in general, however I oppose the proposal for a horse camp (put that on private land instead) and I oppose year-round restrictions on boat use. I question pursuit of a management plan that aims to deliver solitude to floaters on Saturdays in July. To me that seems very unrealistic. For visitors seeking solitude, their options include weekday floats, or late afternoon floats. I've seen no evidence of a need for a wholesale restriction on boating. The overcrowding that occurs can be managed with enforcement and by extremely narrow restrictions. As long as evidence of damage from boats is lacking, restrictions should be minimal.

I experienced one of the most amazing floats ever from Cedar Grove to Akers on a Saturday in the summer when we began the float late in the day - after 3 p.m. At that time, after the flush of rowdy parties had long since gone, we saw eagles, beavers, turtles, fish, and ducks, and a handful of quiet anglers. We experienced the solitude. It contrasted sharply with a previous float that departed at 10 a.m. and we found ourselves behind a bachelorette party and some rowdy fraternity brothers the entire trip. And yet, I am sure the bachelorette and the fraternity brothers now have a warm place in their hearts for the Current River and its scenery and later, when they have children, they will teach them to love the river too. However people are introduced to the Rivers, they are destined to fall in love, which is the first step to becoming good stewards of this very special landscape. The key to preventing damage is education and enforcement.

The NPS should increase its partnerships and projects that focus on the history and heritage of the region. It should aim to develop a curatorial role. In addition, it should work more closely with local landowners, residents, and governments to identify and solve problems.

I'm concerned to that the Riverways lacks enough toilets to prevent unhealthy impacts on the aquatic organisms that depend on the specific habitat of the spring-fed, clear, cold waters. How can the waste from users be better contained and managed than 'using the river'? How can the Park Service design bathroom facilities that require minimal infrastructure and maintenance with maximum user appeal and environmental value? Can composting toilets work? Under what circumstances? What must users know about their good use? Where should facilities be located? How can users be educated and enticed to use them? Can well designed facilities extend the recreation season with different types of visitors? These are challenges that can and must be met, in partnership with concessionaires and with community members. I did not see that toilet facilities were addressed in the GMP and I feel that it cannot be overlooked.

The new and expanded camp grounds proposed in Alternative B should only be approved if the need is documented and if resources are available for construction and for operation and maintenance. Congress should commit more resources to operation of our National Parks, in general.

As the NPS considers incorporating the cycling trail from Van Buren to Big Springs (a great idea!) I caution the NPS to carefully consider its plan to create mountain biking trails. The route of such trails must be very carefully designed to minimize environmental impacts. Anywhere they go there will be some impact and the NPS should soberly consider how it has lost control of trails in the past, leading to numerous illegal roads, trails and traces. How would mountain biking not repeat that pattern? What additional tools and staff are available for enforcement? That said, mountain biking is a lot of fun and its adherents tend to love the outdoor landscapes they use. Responsible outdoor recreationalists must be taught in every endeavor.

As research emerges about the Ozark Hellbender, I urge the NPS to consider what steps can be taken to ensure these aquatic salamanders have a place in the Riverways where they too can live in peace and thrive. If this requires restrictions on use, these restrictions must be developed in partnership with local landowners and river visitors. It would be ideal if people and Hellbenders could thrive in the rivers simultaneously, however, that may not be possible. If not, then I want the NPS to try and find a place somewhere in the Riverways where we humans step aside to allow the Hellbender to live in peace. First, I want NPS to help us learn to respect Hellbender habitat. Obviously I do not want visitors barred from the Rivers. Finding the opportunities is the challenge. I hope it is not insurmountable. It would be a tragedy if people came to think of the Riverways as an either/or instead of a both/and when it comes to aquatic creatures and visiting humans. It would be sad to lose the last of the hellbender population because we cannot govern our behavior.

I think rehabilitating the CCC era buildings at Big Springs is long overdue. The structures are suffering from neglect and need to be upgraded. Problems with mold, aging, and inadequate equipment need to be addressed. That said, I oppose any efforts to put wifi service into our National Parks. Wifi is for luxury hotels, not for national landscapes. Having a few places on the planet that are not wifi accessible is important to many of us - and our National Parks should be those places. Visiting our National Parks should always be a place to unplug. Period. McDonald's restaurants in nearby towns have wifi. The Parks don't need it.

I also encourage the NPS to examine the trout issue. Should we stock Rainbow Trout in a legendary smallmouth bass river? What are the drivers of that decision? Is it economics? Do trout anglers contribute more to the local economy? If so, that should be documented to justify it.

Overall, Missourians love the Riverways, as do all of its visitors. Returning to it year after year is a particular gift, noting its changes, and its constancy. I am grateful for the Riverways, for the stewardship of the NPS and the citizens in the area, and for the opportunity to comment on this Plan.

Thank you.

Yours Truly,

Charlotte L. Smith, St. Louis, MO

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1892	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Black:				

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of

the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Sincerely,  
Susan Thornton

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1893	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 19:38:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	please continue to protect the scenic riverways by closing illegal roads and river crossings to keep our streams clean from pollution, over use, and alcohol abuse.				

keep the trails safe for hikers and others (as dictated by the landowner)

thanks,  
an OTA trail builder

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1894	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 19:46:39				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We support National Park Service protection of the Ozark Riverway - - by whatever means their scientists deem correct. This an important ecosystem for all life and must be maintained safely. We are opposed to people degrading and destroying nature.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1895	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 19:56:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The Oxark Wetlands need to be preserved for the myriad of species which breed and populate that expansive area. Cutting into this area would have many negative effects and end up harming our very much needed sources of fish- -for our necessary food sources!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1896	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 20:06:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

PLease protect this Missouri treasure. I support Alternative B. Families come for the nature's beauty, which is the river. ATVs have wheels for pavement, horse manure should not be in the river changing the stream life, just boats

on our rivers please.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1897    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 20:22:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation ofâ€the Current River and Jacks Fork Riverâ€its free-flowing streamsâ€springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come. National Parks are a valuable resource to Scout units, who also like to help them in service projects when feasible/desired.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1898    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 20:33:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** February 3, 2014

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to express my support of the Draft General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I have been enjoying the ONSR for over 30 years and have been very disappointed in the things Ive seen happening in recent years.

We (myself, my children, my family, and friends) have enjoyed the peace and serenity of a float down the river and the quiet of camping beside the river. We look forward to spending time on the Current and Jacks Fork each summer, even if the drive of 4-5 hours makes it a challenge at times. We have always made every attempt to come on the days when there are the fewest people on the river, so we can enjoy the beauty, the nature, and the peacefulness that spending time on the river affords us. But, in recent years we have noticed that sometimes even on those days when there is less traffic, there is still a lack of the peacefulness and serenity. One of the things that distresses me is the allowance of the giant rafts that hold 6 people. It is my opinion that these should not be allowed. The people who use these rafts are not there to enjoy a natural outing, but usually a party on the water. I believe these rafts are more appropriate for a lake, a river that has not been designated as a national park, or some location where the preservation and enjoyment of nature is not the primary consideration. With the noise level of 6 or more

people there for the party atmosphere, enjoying the quiet of nature is impossible. You miss the birds, wildlife and even the sound of water rushing over the rocks.

I believe that it would be a positive step to adopt Alternative B, but it would be my preference to go with Alternative A, which would offer more protection for the river. There are many rivers in Missouri and surrounding states where people who wish to ride recreational vehicles, horses, and use boats with motors, can go. The purpose of the designation of a national park to the Current and Jacks Fork rivers is to protect them. That should be the primary purpose. I hope that we can remember the purpose establishing the national parks was to leave the land better for our descendants than it is for us. Every change that is made, every activity that is allowed, should have this as the primary consideration.

The preservation of the pristine rivers of Missouri for generations to come is something very important to me. The enjoyment I have experienced on these rivers is something I hope my great-great grandchildren will experience.

Please adopt the plan than will afford this opportunity for future generations.

Sincerely,

Katharine Spigarelli

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1899	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 20:34:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support some preventative measures and clean up action for the Ozark scenic rivers				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1900	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 20:44:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have been following the Draft Mgmt plan for sometime now and I know that there are a lot of opinions and the debate has become very heated. Since you have asked for opinions I will give mine.				

As it is now the Current and the Jacks Fork are supposed to be "scenic" and "protected" but I don't see that the regulations that are already in place being enforced. I think there are several reasons for this, the first and biggest being that there isn't enough agents to patrol the rivers/parks and the second is agents "looking the other way". I have been paddling these rivers for 12 years and I have never been stopped by an agent.

The other issues I see is the high powered motor/jet boats; we have enough erosion as it is from flooding but to have these boats running up and down the river as fast as they can only creates waves that cause additional erosion. Then you have the horses; all I can say is E. coli, I think the Jack's has already shown us how horses affect the river and the quality of the water.

I think that we all should be able to use the rivers but in a manner that still protects them. I think the hp of the boats should be restricted to 10 hp. I don't think we need to add additional horse trails or crossings, no matter what they will continue to use what they are using now and if that is illegal then it should be stopped. The drugs and drinking problem on the river really needs to be reigned in; how can a family with kids be on the river with that going on?

I will admit I haven't personally read the document but have seen enough of the highlights to be concerned. I also have seen comments from elected officials that concern me as well. Just because you live in the 8th district doesn't mean you "own" the rivers. As an "outsider" I spend plenty of money in Shannon County and don't think that locals should have the only say on this issue. Also, let us not forget that this is the Ozark NATIONAL SCENIC Riverways and in my book it is there for all to use but within the regulations set forth.

If you told me I had to pick from the options already presented with no changes I would have to say option A because it protects the land/rivers the most. But I know from what I have read that option B is the option that the NPS is leaning towards and if that is what would be decide on then I could live with that. If you go with option C then you might as well realize that the park as we know it is gone, I am appualed that this is even an option.

I appreciate you giving the public the opportunity to comment and I along with a lot of other people will wait to see what the outcome of all of this is. But let me finish by saying that no matter what is decided that if it isn't enforced then this 15 year study will be for naught.

Regards,  
Pam Huddleston  
Florissant, MO

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1901 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 20:55:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "... preservation of ... the Current River and Jacks Fork River ... its free-flowing streams ... springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.
- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.
- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.
- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.
- Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, which represents 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1902 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 21:30:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please preserve our parks. We enjoy them... beautiful escape to nature.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1903 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of...the Current River and Jacks Fork River...its free-flowing streams...springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

- Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1904	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Black:				

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of...the Current River and Jacks Fork River...its free-flowing streams...springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points

restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you very much.

-Samantha Eppenauer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1905    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Years ago I use to take my son and nephews to Van Buren Mo. swimming and have many special memories from then,at the Current River,such a beautiful place to go flotting or just enjoy a day away from all the stress life brings,so please protect our parks and waterways.

Sincerely,

Donald Crapo

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1906    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 23:12:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The rivers and other waterways in Arkansas are a part of the attractions that brings tourist dollars to this state, why ruin it and send those much needed dollars to another state? I have lived in this state now for nearly 17 years and it is a beautiful state and I would hate to see it ruined by mis-management by people who couldn't care less, only wanting a paycheck and not do their responsibilities they are being paid for. It is bad enough that some of the local state run areas have been closed and left to go to heck, so some fat cat can line his pockets



with the money instead of preserving what God gave us to enjoy. I prefer also to drink clean water, not stagnant, polluted water that cannot be filtered clean.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1907    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 23:37:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

Sincerely,  
Natalie Mannering

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1908    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:05:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a retired children's camp director who has spent my professional life teaching children from all over the U.S the "Leave No Trace" philosophy of wilderness camping. Our campers backpack, canoe and kayak in back country areas all over our country.

I spent my childhood canoeing ,fishing and camping all over Missouri, but particularly on the Current and once on the Jacks Fork River. When my own children were old enough, I took them to the same areas in Missouri that I loved and gave them experiences that I remembered from my family trips. The rivers had just been designated Ozark National Scenic Waterways when my children were growing up. It was less travelled with no motorized vehicles, no motorboats, no horses and generally, very peaceful and restorative. I realize it is a different environment today, some

of which needs to be changed in order to protect the waterway which will also mean ecologically restoring the land surrounding the rivers.

I definitely approve of Plan A, but after talking to so many of the locals at one of the public hearings, I believe that Plan B may be a better compromise. I think there should be year round non motorized boat use with motor free zones and zones for motorized boat use. I also think a permit system for horse use is a good idea with a designated trail system, closing the unofficial trails and restoring ones that are appropriate for the park. I do not think there should be a horse campground in the park (and I am a horse person). Perhaps one could be built outside the park. Hiking trails and new concessions for the Park is also a good idea, because guided float trips and/or backcountry backpacking trips would give the opportunity to educate people and teach appreciation of our natural resources. A big part of the problem

with the abuse of the rivers and parkland is due to ignorance. Interpretive visitor centers can also help to educate, so I am glad to see that and the new campgrounds in the plan. I don't agree with motorized vehicles in the park, much less on gravel bars. They are too damaging and cause noise pollution. Plan B also addresses closing off and restoring unauthorized access to the rivers, but redistributing those drop off and pick up areas so there isn't the overcrowding we have now. That makes sense. I also support the recommendation on Plan B to have 3,430 acres for wilderness management.

I believe that part of the current problem, is lack of personnel for enforcement of Park rules and regulations. It is very difficult to manage a Park of this size and more staff for that purpose is crucial in this new management plan. Immediate enforcement is so important. I hope that funds for this new plan are available for both the work that needs to be done as well as the new enforcement personnel.

I am a strong supporter of the National Park Service and Wilderness designated areas in our country. I have confidence in the NPS's management experience to restore the ONSR so that future generations can continue to appreciate and learn from this beautiful natural resource.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1909	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Black:				

This form letter clearly and cogently expresses my views on this important issue of stewardship of our natural environment. Thank y.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for your consideration.

Brant Hinrichs

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1910	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Black:				

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Dr. Robin Rysavy

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1911	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 04:47:06				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** The best plan to adopt at this time is the NO ACTION PLAN. Based on economy and the amount of monies put back into National Parks by Congress currently this is the only plan that makes sense.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1912 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 05:01:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect our natural resources and the animals that live upon them. We need both the wilderness and all the wild animals including wolves and bears and coyotes.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1913 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 05:23:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alternative B.  
I really enjoy a quiet peaceful float on these beautiful rivers. Please stop the degradation of the rivers caused by ATV's and animal manure. Keep the rivers quiet and clean!

Thank you,  
Barry

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1914 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 05:40:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Protect the Current River

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1915 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.
- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.
- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.
- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.
- Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides

opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1916    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 06:27:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would just like the commission to remember this is a National Park. While concerns over local profit making businesses are important, their welfare does not compare to the welfare of the river and surrounding eco system. The quality of the water, the damage caused by improper use, waste run off etc. all threaten the long term survival of one of the Nations finest natural resources. STRONG controls need to be put in place to halt the run off from all the horse stables, the ATV's tearing up the the areas around the rivers, including the noise which affects the wildlife in the area. The heavy partying which I have personally seen greatly detracts from the enjoyability of the river for the rest of citizens of the United States. Perhaps making the canoe liveries responsible for the persons using their canoes, more patrols during the summer. STIFF penalties for violations, etc.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1917    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 06:31:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please protect the pristine beauty of Arkansas, please protect our waterways, especially the Buffalo National River

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1918    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 06:32:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Horses are the biggest problem here by far, they come to take over the town, trails and river and leaving it all a total mess with their few dollars going to mainly one place :( this gives us all a bad reputation including as well as the state and federal gov. Do the job you should have done years ago and limit the amount of riders that can enter the park with visible numbers on display for identification. this is paramount because notorious for running and hiding without consequence. Catch them in the river and crossing where the should't and give them citations with heavy fines for damaging the delicate river and the endangered hellbender habitat. It will be a lot easier to patrol a few permitted horses than thousands of outlaws running amuck.

.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1919    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 06:36:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Alternative B of the Park Services proposed management plan for the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers. I have witnessed the positive effects of good management by the Watershed Committee in southwest Missouri. These rivers deserve the same protection.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1920    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 06:42:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please protect our waterways. Clean water is something we can not live without for life. As an added feature, water is key to wildlife and provides water for many plants, trees, etc.

We spend lots of money going to other planets and moons with hope of finding water so we go there someday. Nothing wrong with exploring outer space at all.

At the same time let's help protect Earth's water ways in the mean time in case those don't work out or for the ones that plan to stay on earth for life.

Thank you!  
John

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1921    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of...the Current River and Jacks Fork Riverâ€s free-flowing streamsâ€springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.
- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.
- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.
- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.
- Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1922    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of...the Current River and Jacks Fork River...its free-flowing streamsâ€springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.
- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1923    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 07:47:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

Sincerely,

Michael Dobson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1924    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 07:50:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** please can't we keep anything pristine

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1925    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 07:57:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Leave the Rivers and Streams alone. We enjoy them now as they are. It is a waste of taxpayer money and just another freedom taken from us. Let the big city folks take care of their parks and recreation areas and let us take care of ours. Many people depend on the rivers for their livelihood, many of us depend on them for recreation. Our local economy is tied to the river in many areas. We do not need more government in our lives. Soon the only employed will be government employees. How much of our money do you have to waste? You want to lock us out of our land and hire new police to enforce it. Government is too intrusive now. Every aspect of our lives is becoming controlled. Just back off and leave us alone. We are just fine down here in the hills and back woods without anymore rules for our lives.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1926    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 08:04:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO ACTION!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1927    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 08:06:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO ACTION!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1928    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points



restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1929    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 08:11:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have read most of the Draft Management plan & am impressed by the thoroughness of the study. I particularly enjoyed reading about the history of the area. I remember the first time I floated the Current River in the late 60's. I was amazed at the beauty and peacefulness. I was very happy when our country created the Ozark National Riverway to protect the Current & Jack's Fork River, the springs feeding them & the surrounding area. I have been disappointed in the degradation of the area.

I think the Park Service should adopt Alternative A to protect this park from further degradation. There are plenty of other streams in Missouri where people can canoe, run their destructive ATV's and have their drunken parties.

This park needs to be preserved as naturally as possible.

The people who make money off the park will continue to do so, but I am unimpressed by their claims to the land.

The land belongs to the citizens of the United States.

Please take care of these rivers & land that has been entrusted to the National Park Service. Please adopt Alternative A

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1930    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30

years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1931    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 08:32:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE do whatever it takes to protect the waterways. No hog farming, no home-buildings on the rivers, limit the kinds of boating allowed on rivers...nothing ruins a good float on the Buffalo than someone with an outboard motor.

Once these beautiful ancient places are tainted it is impossible to restore them. Once there has been development and pollution they are ruined. PLEASE don't let that happen. PLEASE!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1932    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams, springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.
- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.
- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.
- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.
- Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Ed Stierli

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1933    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 08:51:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alternative A

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1934    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 08:52:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Jack's Fork and Current River areas are some of the most splendid areas in Missouri. What a joy it is to canoe and fish the waters with out the noise of motorized vehicles. It is a way to "get away," not far from home. My vote would be to keep it as primitive as possible and to cut down on the water crossings.

Thank you for listening.  
Gerald Noble

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1935    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of...the Current River and Jacks Fork Riverâ€s free-flowing streamsâ€springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.
- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.
- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.
- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.
- Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1936    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 09:13:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I grew up on the Current, Jacks Fork, and Eleven Point rivers. Truly, there is no place else on Earth quite like the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please protect them to the maximum possible extent; we owe it to our children, grandchildren, and their grandchildren.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1937    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 09:15:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Alternative B for public use of Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Public recreation is important, but more important is protecting these streams and the habitat they provide for animals and plants. There are many places to go for recreation, but these streams are unique and irreplaceable. Alternative B is a good balance of recreation and environmental protection, allowing public use while preserving the resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1938    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 09:16:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support plan B. We have a beautiful park that deserves care and protection. At the same time I urge NPS to consider its tactics in dealing with the public and its fellow residents in the area. Requiring permits for baptism services at the river is an example of stupid heavy handed tactics that are typical of the Federal government and the other world of Washington DC that have helped create so much distrust. The condition and preservation of the beautiful wild land and rivers while accommodating and growing the tourism economy are important and that is why I support plan B.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1939    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

Over the years our family has enjoyed weekend canoe trips to the Current and other Ozark rivers. We have found that rivers and streams within Ozark National Scenic Riverways are among the most beautiful and best for canoeing in the Midwest.

We believe that redirecting some recreational activities to areas where damage is minimized, establishing levels of use that keep the rivers cleaner, and allowing damaged areas to heal are the keys to stewardship of the Ozark Riverways. And this can be done while adding to the local economy.

We want the Ozark Riverways managed for natural and recreational values.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

We support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved

into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1940    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 09:23:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It would be my wish that the park service not make any more changes to the restrictions of use of our parks. Our heritage, lands and lively hoods have already been greatly affected by the rules and regulations implemented by the NPS. I often wonder who exactly it is that these lands have been purchased for? With our tax dollars no less, supposedly to benefit us all, are to benefit?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1941    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 09:25:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We love the Ozarks and their rivers as the key part of Missouri's beauty and tourist industry. It is essential that the National Riverways remain a presence there, not only for their funds but for their expertise, their planning, and their professionalism. While we expect and want local input for their plans, local control would endanger our state's greatest resource. We need the national government to help us preserve and enhance their attraction, safety, and future.

Thank you,

Keith Shahan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1942    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 09:30:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The pig farms that were built by Cargil on the Buffalo River watershed must be stopped. They never should have been approved. More oversight needs to be put in place to guard against these types of activities along the river and watershed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1943    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 09:32:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

NO ACTION

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1944    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 09:37:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** These watersheds are irreplaceable in their value. Please work to protect our gorgeous and precious springs and free rivers. Our Soul needs these places for renewal and Nature is the best healer. Let's keep Missouri ahead of the rest in caring for our water resources. We can protect them from further pollution and degradation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1945    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 09:45:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I used to work for DNR in Missouri as a young college student. I explored as much as I could of the area as I could manage while I was there and continue to return for new adventures with my family that remain there. From beneath the ground in one of the many caverns to cruising the waterways at the surface to climbing it's highest reaches, I have truly beheld the natural wonders that Missouri has to offer. While it's nice to stand in "awe" of natural wonder, Missouri is also where I learned that if you really do care about it staying pristine, then you have to do something about it because the population is riddled with too many that don't care, and they even blatantly litter before you as if the whole place is a receptacle. I joined the Missouri River Relief, literally picked up after these types along the river, and realized how bad it was in this regard. Still, these efforts every year after year, have amazingly brought a restored beauty to an industrial river and many more are now able to find refuge in it's riverbanks and even join in keeping it clean. Missouri's rich scenic tapestry provided for me a pivotal growth as a human being recognizing that we share this world and actions have consequence. I live in the desert along a river now and the regions inhabitants know all too well how important that river is. There would be no life without it. Please, preserve the abundant natural landscape Missouri has to offer all the next generations of human beings who will need to find connection to the natural world.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1946    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 10:00:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Alternative A being reviewed for the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways offers the strongest protections for the rivers. Our responsibility to the unique life on the rivers and the future generations of Missourians demands this level of protection.

I support Alternative A as the only logical and moral choice of management plans.

Sincerely,  
Joyce Huster  
Lifetime Missouri resident

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1947    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points

restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1948 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 10:05:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In general, I support Alt. B with a few exceptions:

- Allow motorized use above Pulltite
- Negotiate with a concessionaire (from outside the area) to build a lodge and visitors center near Two Rivers or Powder Mill.
- Build and relocate park offices and HQs to Two Rivers, Powder Mill or Shawnee.

Thanks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1949 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 10:21:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a frequent user of the Riverways I have a great appreciation for the over site and direction offered by the NPS. I believe that recent comments by some politicians about Missouri taking over management are totally misguided and are political grandstanding.

In my opinion slightly greater restrictions would enhance the Park but that wholesale change in either direction would create problems.

I would be willing to pay a daily or annual usage fee to help support improvements to the Riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1950 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

My family and I have enjoyed canoeing, kayaking, fishing and camping in the Ozark Scenic Riverways for several decades. I wish to express my support for Alternative B. Stewardship of this magnificent natural treasure requires greater regulation of its usage.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesiganted

trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1951    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 10:42:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please NO ACTION, necessary. Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1952    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 10:43:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please NO ACTION, necessary. Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1953    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs,



representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1954    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1955    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 10:47:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please close off all roads but those needed for routine canoe put in or take out. Keep or increase motorized water craft restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1956    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 10:59:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I live in Hot Springs National Park, Arkansas. I am an avid trail runner and outdoor enthusiast. I get a lot of pleasure from the wild areas, waterways, and wildlife in Arkansas. Please protect the forests and wild areas and the wildlife and birds that call it home. Arkansas is a unique and beautiful place that needs your protection. And the wildlife adds to the incredible experience of the Ozarks and Arkansas as a whole.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1957    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 11:00:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** No action is needed to further regulate the national parks and waterways in Missouri.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1958    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 11:09:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The preservation of the Ozarks is a very important issue for the economy and ecological systems in southern Missouri, as well as the long stretch of waterways the natural springs in that area provide life to. I believe education of the beautiful and extremely diverse scenic lands of the Ozark national waterways is

fundamental if we plan to preserve the natural resources for generations. In an economy where revenue seems to trump keeping natural habitats pure, alive and unpolluted; i believe choosing an alternative action plan is a way to take a stand against abusing the 200 million plus gallons of unpolluted fresh water provided daily by the springs, and preserve these resources that have supported for over 12,000 years. I support alternative plan B. I believe this plan offers a good balance of recreation and education. I am very supportive of restoring some areas to their natural habitat while also expanding educational outposts in the area. I also support keeping recreational uses at a more traditional and unmotorized status. I believe taking no action to be unacceptable. As times change, populations and economies grow, it is of up most importance that we keep up with the efforts of past generations to preserve and protect Missouri's beautifully unique karst landscape and resources. This is why I support alternative action plan B.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1959    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 11:09:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I prefer Alternative A for the GMP of the ONSR.

I oppose the use of motorized boats & equestrian use on & in the rivers in the park. This park's problems have included the seemingly ever-expanding presence of motorized vehicles and their maze of eroded tracks in riparian areas and on gravel bars; the explosive growth of equestrian use and proliferation of undesignated trails and river crossings (many of which are in sensitive riverine areas or on steep, heavily-eroded slopes); overcrowding in certain reaches of the rivers and resulting conflicts among user groups, coupled with the rowdy behavior of some visitors; and inadequate monitoring and enforcement of scenic easements.

I feel Plan A will decrease the number of access points and close illegally developed roads/trails. It will limit the horse power of motorboats above Two Rivers. Plan A provides better usage of the rivers by horses and motorizes boats. It limits access to the rivers by motorized vehicles except on official roads. It eliminates illegal horse trails and reduces river crossings. These changes reduce E Coli contamination and make the rivers safer for swimming. Plan A proposes reasonable gravel bar usage and stops the damage and contamination by horses. This will have the potential to restore gravel bars to their natural state.

Plan A has the best chance of reversing the harmful effects on the rivers and returning them to the condition they were in when the Scenic Riverways was established.

Anne Hussar  
Member of OWWC  
9918 Marty Street  
Overland Park, KS 66212

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1960    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 11:13:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** GET RID OF THIS CAFO on the banks of BIG CREEK, one of the largest tributaries to the Buffalo National River. BNR is party to a suit at this this point.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1961    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I love canoeing on the Jacks Fork and Current. I hate motorboats on the river....it's very disturbing.

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1962    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 11:19:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm for Alternative A in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan. Thanks, Steve

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1963    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 11:28:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** May be you are to old to do any more than go to the river and maybe hobble out with your lawn chair and sit and enjoy the flow of the water over your body and the small fish tickling you as they feed off your skin, but that does not excuse you from your effort to stop the rape and desecration of our natural waterways and man made lakes by the greed of a few who continue to feed of the fat of the land to fill their coffers with more filthy lucre. Thank of your Children, grandchildren and all those other people you know or not and their children and grandchildren .. They have a right to enjoy as well .. If the government will not stop them then we must .. Do not allow them to run rough shod over us. Rid the world of the blatant disregard for right over blight.

Jon K. Edwards

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1964    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 11:59:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No changes. There are so few things struggling families have for recreation that changes will hurt everyone. If it isn't broke, don't try to fix it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1965    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 11:59:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent:

I'm writing to share my comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan (GMP).

I prefer Alternative B as outlined in the Draft General Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement.

Specifically, my experience in the Riverways in the following recreational uses: Camping, floating & hiking.

These uses are important to me because I absolutely love clean water, the biodiversity of this unique ecosystem, wildflowers and a pristine natural environment I can escape to such as the National Scenic Riverways.

In addition, I appreciate the conservation and preservation functions of the National Park because it's just a really special gem of our state, the great rivers state!

The primary area(s) I use are Round Spring & Akers access. I've also spent time in Montauk, and I really love the Jack's Fork float from Buck's Hollow too. I am an avid Stream Teamer and have also participated in 2 clean-ups on the Current River, as well as a trail build with the Ozark Trail group.

The 'No Action' alternative is unacceptable to me because it fails to address the need for more enforcement of existing laws and standards, to better manage overcrowding, and to improve communication and partnership with local landowners and communities. Further, it fails to address these critical problems in the Riverways:

â€ Vehicle use on unauthorized roads & vehicles on gravel bars should be restricted which would help reduce ecosystem damage and protect public safety;

â€ Address concession (floaters) drop off and pick up location overcrowding in certain areas by redistributing them to include 20 new designated access points while keeping the total designated access points constant. (Alternative C also does this.)

â€ No horse campgrounds in the Riverways (25 sites are proposed for Alternatives B and C). We do not agree that the ONSR needs a designated horse camp in the park, preferring that this opportunity be developed by the private sector, on private land in proximity to the park. Instead of a new development of this magnitude, we ask that NPS work with existing local businesses to provide a concession horse camping operation outside the park that would have less impact on park resources within the narrow river corridor.

â€ Motorized boats should have some restrictions; I have found it very unnerving to be floating in a canoe or swimming when a jet boat rounds a corner going at a fast rate of speed. I agree with MO Coalition for the Environment on minimal boat restrictions in opposing year-round prohibitions on boats in certain stretches of the Riverways because such restrictions would eliminate opportunities for area residents to enjoy the Riverways. We think any restrictions on boats should be minimal and driven by evidence of a problem that only restrictions will solve. If better enforcement will solve the problem we prefer that to prohibitions.

â€ The restoration of impaired riverbanks that avoids developed facilities along the rivers, which are screened from view from the river in any case, and low impact. We suggest that heavily engineered solutions be avoided (e.g. Rock and weirs) and instead NPS talent and experience be employed to bring natural landscape design and sustainable structures appropriate to the site.

â€ Prioritization of solutions for problem areas that focuses on low-impacts in riparian zones. For example, the area across from Welch Spring should be restored where heavily rutted unauthorized roads mar an undeveloped bank. Damaged areas should not serve as opportunity to add new 'hardened' development where it does not belong and instead should receive restoration.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways ('Riverways'), established on August 17, 1964, encompasses 134 miles of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. The Riverways' enabling act has three stated purposes: preservation, conservation, and recreation. As Missouri's largest National Park, it showcases several world-class freshwater springs, caves, and bluffs that are home to fish, birds, rare and endangered native amphibians, crawfish, and plants. It is a testament to Missouri's commitment to conservation that the Riverways is a National Park and was the nation's first National River.

The Current River and Jacks Fork are prime recreational waters in a stunning natural karst area that attracts approximately 1.5 million visitors each year. A 2011 study estimated visitor spending at more than \$55 million with nearly 90 percent of spending from non-local visitors. As a unit of the National Park System, management of the Riverways must ensure protection of the Park's resources in an unimpaired condition for public recreation, education, and scientific value. Among its tasks is sustaining and restoring bio-diversity for the next generation.

The management of ONSR-in terms of resource preservation, sustainable use management, and restoration of

natural ecosystems-should rival that of our nation's most pristine and unique public lands.

Yours truly,

Melanie Cheney  
10450 S. Route N, Columbia, MO 65203

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1966    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 12:13:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1967    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 12:18:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

The National Park Service has offered 3 reasonable alternatives for better management. I prefer Alternative B for several reasons, one being it strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

Thank you for your time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1968    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 12:18:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Plan 'B' is what I would like to see implemented.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1969    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 12:24:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

"NO ACTION"

Thank you for allowing comments on this issue.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1970 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 12:25:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The National Park Service's reasoning for changing the horse power limits is based on flawed premises. The idea that forcing floaters south of Van Buren will cause an increase in tourist floating is an assumption that has no validity. The inference that the boats on the rivers cause bank erosion must be forwarded by people that have never seen a 30 foot flood or a mouth long flood averaging 10 to 20 feet flood. After these mud, gravel, and sand moving events the river is able to return to it's (to barrow a term) Pristine ecosystem. Rather than remove boats maybe floods should be done away with. At a minimum, leave the boat horse power limits where they are and allow boats with greater than 60/40 launch at Van Buren and travel south of Big Springs Boat Launch. The Current and the Jacks Fork rivers are not delicate and deteriorating but are robust and self healing. The belief that the boats are endangering the floaters please show me the reports of floaters physically injured by boats. The reality is that more floaters are saved by privately owned boats than by all the Park service boats.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1971 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 12:32:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have enjoyed many of the different rivers in the Ozarks. They are some of the most breathtaking rivers in the world. Some of them small/intimate rivers that are a source of joy to my heart and soul. They are all a reminder of the incredible wealth of wildlife and the value of uncontaminated free flowing waterways. I was never afraid to swim in these rivers when canoeing, and believed them to be pretty pristine. It would be a huge loss to the Natural world and to mankind to allow anything to damage/harm these rivers. I hope everything possible will be done to maintain their integrity and BEAUTY !

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1972 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, and have seen their degradation increasing as public use increases. I believe something must be done to preserve our fabulous streams and rivers.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed to preserve its high biodiversity for enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1973 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support alternative B. I have done many things in the ONSR since before 1964. Proper management is important to its sustainable future use by everyone and the prservation of its unique species and qualities. It belongs to all of us and not just local residents. The residents would lose what we all value but also

many risk their livelihoods if the rivers no longer offer the quality experience all visitors treasure.

I agree broadly also with the following statements.

Thank you,

Larry Nolan

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1974 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 12:51:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a handy capped senior and use my ATV not only for hunting but to avail myself of the wonders of the Ozark hills. I have been riding trails in the National Scenic Riverways for well over 40 years. In that time I have yet to experience the environmental issues that the Park Service has claimed to exist. What I have seen is a ever increasing shutting out access to a park that was originally to guaranty access to the public for recreational preposess. Don't shutdown trails, open them up!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1975 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 12:52:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** MISSOURI PARKS ASSOCIATION COMMENTS ON DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN,  
OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS -

The Missouri Parks Association, a statewide citizens organization of more than 3,000 members dedicated to the protection, enhancement and interpretation of Missouri state parks and historic sites, appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Draft GMP for the ONSR. We have long been interested in securing stronger management of ONSR because of its state park roots and its important role in the history, ecology and economy of this region of the Ozarks as well as its national significance. We salute the National Parks Service for addressing many of the problems that have grown and festered at ONSR in recent decades.

**WE AGREE WITH NPS THAT ALTERNATIVE B PROVIDES THE BEST BALANCE AMONG THE THREE ALTERNATIVES WHILE STILL ADDRESSING OUR PRINCIPAL CONCERNS.** Due to changes and increase pressure on the ONSR the No Action Alternative or status quo is neither feasible nor adaptive and is 25 years old.

WE appreciate the NPS emphasis on protection and interpretation of the extraordinary resources of the Riverways, both natural and cultural, and its commitment to deal with unauthorized roads, horse trails, proliferation of river access and crossings, and ATV use; to restore degraded land and riverbanks, especially in the riparian corridor; and to use zoning and other systems to better distribute visitor use and avoid conflicts. All of this should contribute to a healthier river, enhanced regional economy, and increased visitor satisfaction.

We do have some specific concerns connected with aspects of Alternative B, as follows:

**STAFFING LEVELS:** WE are mystified regarding proposed staffing levels as reflected in Table 10, page 1124 of the GMP, as compared with A and C, and urge your careful attention to properly adjusting these levels in the final draft. Especially troubling is the lack of any proposed new staff in resource management and science, when staffing in this area is more than doubled in Alternatives A and C and these are the staff who will have responsibility for restoration of degraded lands in the riparian corridor. There are also four times as many new interpretations and education staff proposed for A and C as for B. If this is simply a slip in the final stages of plan preparation and the total staffing level for Alternative B cannot be increased beyond the 98 total staff in the table, we would urge that restoration of degraded lands in the riparian corridor receive priority over construction of new infrastructure and facilities.

**RESTORATION OF PROBLEM AREAS:** Seriously degraded areas, such as the river bottom land across from Welch Spring that has been marred by a maze of unauthorized, heavily rutted roads and traces, should be restored to natural river bottom forest, not hardened for continued motorized use. This side of the river should be maintained in a natural state as a scenic asset for visitors to the developed area across the River at Welch Spring and for floaters passing on the River.

**HORSE TRAILS AND CAMPING:** WE strongly believe it is critical to close and restore the random maze of unauthorized horse trails and river crossings and to develop better designed trails that avoid sensitive riparian areas. There is not a city, county, state or national park anywhere in the United States that would allow such a chaotic maze of equestrian use. WE support consideration of an equestrian permit system to manage the burgeoning horse use. Further, we believe that a private horse camp ground outside the park would contribute more to the local economy and conserve limited park lands for less damaging uses.

**PRIMITIVE AND GRAVEL BAR CAMPING:** WE strongly urge the closing of the unauthorized maze of roads to primitive campsites and gravel bars, and the clear designation of unauthorized primitive sites and gravel bar camps, some accessible by motor vehicles and some walk-in. **WE ASK THAT ALL DESIGNATED PRIMITIVE AND GRAVEL BAR CAMPS ACCESSIBLE BY MOTOR VEHICLE BE SCREENED FROM VIEW FROM THE RIVER,** just as developed campgrounds are. Gravel bars and primitive camps should of course continue to be freely available for camping and day use from the River.

**HORSEPOWER ZONES:** WE support the proposed horsepower limits for river zones, though we recognize gigging with motors as a traditional use and are willing to consider an exception to the non-motorized zones in the upper reaches of the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers for such use in the non-peak season.

**NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCE RESTORATION:** WE strongly support both natural and cultural resource restoration, but believe that in riparian areas there should be no new conversion of bottomland forests to



open fields. Forested riparian corridors are critical to stabilize riverbanks, especially in view of the likely impacts of climate change and severe weather events. All restoration should be accomplished using native species.

**SCENIC EASEMENTS:** Although not discussed in the GMP, there are more than 9,000 acres of private riverine lands under scenic easements to the NPS and these easements need to be effectively monitored, enforced, and corrected to avoid the sorts of violations that have occurred in recent decades.

**WILDERNESS:** WE commend the NPS for its management of the /big Spring backcountry for its wildland values, just as it was managed by state park officials since the 1920's, and we ask that management of this 3,430 acre de facto wilderness continue into the future, as proposed in Alternative B, in order to provide continued opportunity for wilderness type recreation and to maintain the area's availability for possible eventual designation by Congress.

**HIKING TRAILS:** WE support the proposed increase in of hiking trails and especially urge NPS to partner with other federal and state agencies and non-governmental organizations to develop interconnected long-distance hiking trails across multiple ownerships.

**FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF THE OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS:** The Riverways has seen a 30 percent reduction in staff during the last decade and many times are blamed by local and state citizens for ineffective management. The NPS simply cannot fulfill their stewardship and citizen engagement mission with this severe cut in staff which compounds problems within the ONSR. We believe these cuts are ill advised and have ben proportionally greater than at many other NPS units. **FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT OF ENHANCED FUNDING LEVELS BY THE REGIONAL AND NATIONAL OFFICES OF NPS IS ABSOLUTELY CRITICAL IF THE NEW MANAGEMENT PLAN IS TO BE SUCCESSFUL IN REVERSING DEGRADATION OF RESOURCES AND ENHANCING VISITOR EXPERIENCES FOR THE LONG TERM.**

Finally, the Missouri Parks Association pledge to continue to work with ONSR and to encourage other organizations, citizens, and public officials to do so as well in order to solve and rectify these problems, enhance visitor experiences, contribute more to the local economy, and to make this park and natural river system one which we can all be proud. We ask ONSR to utilize stakeholder processes, properly balanced between local and non-local users, to work out these critical management issues remaining after adoption of a new and updated General Management Plan in a continued adaptive approach.

STEVE NAGLE, President, Missouri Parks Association

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1976    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 12:52:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please, protect the ozarks!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1977    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 12:54:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Several years ago a pine forest fire occurred on the northern Carter County border. Due to the cabling off the fire trails by the Park Service and the tree growth, due to lack of use of the fire trails, the fire trucks could not get more than a few feet after cutting the cables. Three homes burned down that night and one of the fire trucks and crew where almost burned to death trying to turn around in an overgrown fire trail. The cabling was done to protect unidentified endangered species. The study that was to identify them was to be done in ten years. That was well over fifteen years ago and it still has not been done. Open the fire trails back up and clear the trees out of the trails. The next fire may do more than just take homes.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1978    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 12:58:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** If the Park Service chooses the Alternative B (NPS preferred) it will completely destroy my family tradition of fish gigging above Pulltite on the Current River. Gigging season runs from September 15 to January 31 annually. It has been a family tradition in my family for SEVEN (7) generations and the park service is going to take this away. Part of the Park Service Mission is to preserve the culture of the local area. This part of the plan will destroy a large part of the local culture. Not only is gigging above Pulltite a cultural and family tradition, it is a time for families like mine to build memories that will last a lifetime. I strongly oppose any Park Service Plan to restrict motor boats above Pulltite during Peak Season (March 15- Sept. 15) or Off Peak Season (Sept. 16-March14). We as locals from this area deserve the right to enjoy the Current River above Pulltite all year long. We also run motor boats above Pulltite during the summer (Peak Season) for recreational enjoyment and the Alternative B will take this away as well. I may add that running a motor boat above Pulltite is also a cultural and family tradition. I have an abundant amount of relatives that owned or still own land above Pulltite and we would no longer be able to enjoy the swimming holes, gravel bars, and shade trees that my family has enjoyed for over one hundred years.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1979 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 12:59:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** If the Park Service chooses the Alternative B (NPS preferred) it will completely destroy my family tradition of fish gigging above Pulltite on the Current River. Gigging season runs from September 15 to January 31 annually. It has been a family tradition in my family for SEVEN (7) generations and the park service is going to take this away. Part of the Park Service Mission is to preserve the culture of the local area. This part of the plan will destroy a large part of the local culture. Not only is gigging above Pulltite a cultural and family tradition, it is a time for families like mine to build memories that will last a lifetime. I strongly oppose any Park Service Plan to restrict motor boats above Pulltite during Peak Season (March 15- Sept. 15) or Off Peak Season (Sept. 16-March14). We as locals from this area deserve the right to enjoy the Current River above Pulltite all year long. We also run motor boats above Pulltite during the summer (Peak Season) for recreational enjoyment and the Alternative B will take this away as well. I may add that running a motor boat above Pulltite is also a cultural and family tradition. I have an abundant amount of relatives that owned or still own land above Pulltite and we would no longer be able to enjoy the swimming holes, gravel bars, and shade trees that my family has enjoyed for over one hundred years.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1980 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 13:05:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** NO ACTION

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1981 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 13:28:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am glad that the Jacks Fork and Current rivers are being preserved. I would like the Park Services to engage with the locals on an ongoing bases and try harder to educate them about the aims and objectives of the rules.

About the NEED for rules.

PS; Your notification process discriminates against us computer phobic people.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1982 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation ofâ€the Current River and Jacks Fork Riverâ€its free-flowing streamsâ€springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1983	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 13:38:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** If the Park Service chooses the Alternative B (NPS preferred) it will completely destroy my family tradition of motor boating above Round Springs. As a boy I grew up in Eminence MO but my family either owned farms bordering the Park Service land at Round Springs or leased land near Round Springs. My family also has two cabins on the river near Round Springs. So I would like to point out that even though I live in Eminence my heart and soul belong near Round Springs. I spend vacation days at my family's cabins at Round Springs, hunt near Round Springs, gig above and below Round Springs, motor boat above and below Round Springs, as well as many other outdoor activities. The thought of losing the right to run my motor boat above Round Springs actually brings tears to my eyes. As a young boy with an adventurous personality I would put my father's boat in the Current River at the Round Springs lower landing and run his 25 hp boat and motor up to Sinking Creek and back to Round Springs. During the summer, I would fish that stretch of river above Round Springs, swim in my favorite swimming holes, lie on the gravel bar next to my favorite swimming holes, and have family picnics. I also have a handicapped brother (that cannot walk) that I lift into my father's motor boat and take him for boat rides because a motor boat is more stable than a canoe. If you implement this Alternative B you will also take one of the few enjoyments he gets from life. I hope you realize how much devastation you will actually cause by taking away our rights to use Current River above Round Springs. With the preferred plan B of the Park Service this cultural and family tradition will be stripped from me and my family FOREVER. Again this is so dear to my heart it actually bring tears to my eyes to think about a bunch of Park Service Employees from Colorado and Omaha, and extreme environmentalists getting to make the call on where I can enjoy the river that I have used for the last 27 years. NOT MENTION THAT I HAVE A SON THAT IS ALMOST THREE YEARS OLD AND HE IS NOT GOING TO BE ABLE TO ENJOY THE SAME PART OF THE RIVER THAT I WAS ABLE TO GROWING UP. The holes of water that I fished as a young boy, swam in as a young boy, motor boated as a young boy, and had family picnics as a young boy will not be passed on to my son due to this new general management plan you are trying implement. It is not right for the Park Service to adopt a plan that only benefits the extreme environmentalists, there is not one section in the (NPS preferred) Alternative B that benefits the locals in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Park of the Parks mission is to preserve the cultural traditions, NOT DESTROY THE CULTURAL TRADITIONS!!!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1984	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 13:41:24				

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There are so few places left where people can really enjoy unspoiled nature, so please keep our Ozark riverways from being damaged!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1985 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 13:51:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As someone who lives on land association property that borders the Jacks Fork River, I am in favor of Alternative A and all measures that provide the greatest level of protection for water quality and surrounding ecology even where that restricts human access and activity. I value these wild places highly and believe we need to preserve areas free of human-caused harm.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1986 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 13:55:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a lifetime horse owner and trail rider, I want trails to remain open.

In the development of National Park Service General Management Plans, I support the protection of natural resources while providing access to recreational activities and specifically horseback riding; and I advocate a blend of activities that allow for protection and restoration of degraded biological communities without denying equine access.

A well managed, strategically planned, maximum mileage, designated trail system, and its maintenance is a guarantee for use by future generations. I support such a development process and acknowledge education and promotion of outdoor ethics, such as the Leave No Trace Stock program are paramount to the process.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1987 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 14:13:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** If the Park Service chooses the Alternative B (NPS preferred) it will restrict motor boats above West Eminence on the Jacks Fork River from March 15-September 15 as well as restrict motor boats above Bay Creek all year long. I grew up in Eminence and I have run my motor boat above Eminence regularly. Not only is it a family tradition to run my motor boat above Eminence, but I have helped tourists during floods on many occasions. If the Park Service restricts motor boat use above Eminence and the Jacks Fork River floods I will not be able to run my motor boat from Eminence to Alley Spring and rescue people and their belongings during floods. For example, one summer I actually rescued four tourist's canoes and all of their belongings. I even refused to take any compensation for my time and costs. See what the Park Service does not understand is that we locals help the tourists that float the Jack Fork and Current Rivers and do not expect anything in return. I have helped several other floaters on different occasions and do not expect anything in return. The locals are from these small surrounding towns and we have a desire to help people. All we ask is that we get to keep our rights to these rivers!! I have also talked to many other motor boat users and they have similar stories of rescuing and helping floaters in emergencies. The Park needs to understand that the Park Rangers cannot be everywhere and it takes the help of the locals to keep everyone safe on these beautiful rivers. If the Park Service wants more deaths and more people to be hurt on the rivers without any help nearby then they are choosing the right plan. I feel that the Park Service needs to completely rethink their ideas on how this will affect everyone involved. I will hurt and probably even kill people on both the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers without the presence of the local motor boaters.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1988 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 14:16:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent:  
I'm writing to share my comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan (GMP).

In my opinion, there is only one thing that needs to change- enforcement. As with most issues in this country, if we would support and fund the enforcement of current laws/rules/regulations these problems would not exist. If the

current rules had been consistently enforced, we wouldn't be having this fight.

It doesn't matter who is in charge. It doesn't even matter what the rules are. Enforcement and education are the only way to successfully protect our natural resources. Educate so that everyone knows what the rules (and consequences) are; and, enforce the rules consistently and equally.

Thank you for your time,  
Tony Pierce

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1989    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1990    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 14:20:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO ACTION

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1991    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 14:26:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Take no action.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1992    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 14:31:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Focus should be on preservation while making the area a destination for non-motorized sightseeing and exploration. Non-essential hunting and motorized recreation makes the park less of a destination and more of a backwoods dumping ground. Groups such as St Louis's GORC and Kansas City's Earth Riders should be courted to design, build, and maintain a top tier trail network for hikers, tourists, and cyclists to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1993 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 14:32:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Park Service has a responsibility to protect and maintain the waterways, springs, and lakes that are part of the park system.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1994 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 14:37:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** NO ACTION.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1995 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 14:38:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I prefer the National Park Service alternative B with the addition of more hiking trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1996 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 14:41:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Ozarks are a national treasure. We must take steps to ensure they are protected from industry, overfishing, development.

I vote for Alternative A.

Let's ensure that wild and beautiful Missouri remains for generations to come to enjoy camping, canoeing, hiking, nature walks.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Debra Hardin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1997 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 14:45:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** MISTAKE ON THE LAST SENTENCE OF THIS COMMENT, The I was supposed to be a It.

Thanks, Sorry for the mistake.

If the Park Service chooses the Alternative B (NPS preferred) it will restrict motor boats above West Eminence on the Jacks Fork River from March 15-September 15 as well as restrict motor boats above Bay Creek all year long. I grew up in Eminence and I have run my motor boat above Eminence regularly. Not only is it a family tradition to run my motor boat above Eminence, but I have helped tourists during floods on many occasions. If the Park Service restricts motor boat use above Eminence and the Jacks Fork River floods I will not be able to run my motor boat from Eminence to Alley Spring and rescue people and their belongings during floods. For example, one summer I actually rescued four tourist's canoes and all of their belongings. I even refused to take any compensation for my time and costs. See what the Park Service does not understand is that we locals help the tourists that float the Jack Fork and Current Rivers and do not expect anything in return. I have helped several other floaters on different occasions and do not expect anything in return. The locals are from these small surrounding towns and we have a desire to help people. All we ask is that we get to keep our rights to these rivers!! I have also talked to many other motor boat users and they have similar stories of rescuing and helping floaters in emergencies. The Park needs to understand that the Park Rangers cannot be everywhere and it takes the help of the locals to keep everyone safe on

these beautiful rivers. If the Park Service wants more deaths and more people to be hurt on the rivers without any help nearby then they are choosing the right plan. I feel that the Park Service needs to completely rethink their ideas on how this will affect everyone involved. It will hurt and probably even kill people on both the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers without the presence of the local motor boaters.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1998    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 14:50:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We need Alternative D Give all land back to DNR,or the state of Mo. It seems like the Fed park Service can't take care of what land they do own. Look at ALLEY SPRING, Akers ferry, and Big Springs in Van Buren, Mo. Fed gov. needs to work only on parks, an leave the river issues to LOCAL, or State enforment. I've floated these river 40 years, and never see a park ranger on the rivers. Sell the land back to the public... This is prime agricultural land, all up and down Current Jacks fork. Take out 40 miles of trail rides, an you have just stripped the tourist season in half..Than Eminence will just fold up.... Schools will fail, no tax base on tourist money. Maybe this is what the park wants, my kids and grandkids may want more out of life, than to call the park service for a permit to go to public rivers. This land has can be used by local and tourist. Boats,trappers,canoes,tubes,horses,hikers,cavers { which are all locked up }, bikes,4wheeles,trucks, public use. Leave our rivers alone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1999    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 14:51:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There are way too many canoes being rented by outfitters. There are ATV's everywhere and they use them to cart in all their refreshments, leaving the cans and trash. It's my guess that a lot of those car tires you see laying there along side the river come in on ATV's. I love our National Parks! It's what my family does on vacation, we go to National Parks. Since I am a canoeist and I am only 4hrs away from ONSR I have been there more than any other unit. And it's so depressing! It seems like ONSR is the National Park Service's UNWANTED STEPCHILD. It is understaffed, underfunded and appears to be unloved. The Rangers who like every Ranger I ever met are extremely helpful, especially Ranger Austin, but they don't seem to be entitled to wear campaign hats. There are a lot of young people from KC and St. Louis coming to canoe and mostly party and I thing it would be a good thing for them to see that distinctive hat to remind them of where they are at.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2000    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 15:09:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I trust NPS planning process and support Alternative B, the preferred plan as it seems to have been reached logically and to benefit the majority of citizens. I understand there is a movement to transfer management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to the state. I do not support that proposal. I believe that movement is driven by unfounded fear cultivated by local and national special interests and attempts through organized intimidation and misinformation to gain control of the area as a statement of anti government sentiment and to weaken environmental protection initiatives.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2001    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 15:11:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the NPS Alternate B plan which is supported by the Missouri Coalition for the Environment and Friends of the Ozark Riverways, along with their concerns and suggested improvements. Foremost in my mind is that the NPS provide accessible hiking and walking trails for senior citizens that may be prohibited to other users on bikes or motorize vehicles. With all the useful projects the NPS is proposing in the Riverways, the more they can keep the natural beauty intact in constructing their projects, the more all users will benefit from its beauty.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2002    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 15:13:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I don't think there needs to be anymore changes on the Current or Jacks Fork river's . that is where we all go to to relax. it was meant to enjoy or God would have not gave it to us. yes there is some people that

doesn't respect it but the majority does. and WE the motor boater's try and clean up after the one's that trash it. So please leave it be.

Thank You  
Jim Robbins

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2003    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 15:13:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My comments are short. First, it is societally short sighted if we do not rein in unrestricted exploitation of our natural rivers. The exploiters obviously do not care about what their children and grandchildren will inherit as long as they get what they want now.

Second,I fully support the comments and suggestions of the Missouri Parks Association with regard to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2004    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 15:22:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Why do we want more federal control in Missouri? No Action should be taken on this initiative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2005    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 15:28:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Unathorized ROADS to the Scenic Waterways:

If it is on private land, BLOCK and FINE for driving from private land thru Park property.

If the road is on Park property, put FEW primitive camp sites close to the blocked road.

NO motorizes vehicls, water or Land, allowed access to OUR OZARK WATERWAYS.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2006    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 15:33:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I do not favor any of the new regulations under the proposed plans, the ONSR should choose the No-Action alternative.

By prohibiting vehicle access to the gravel bars, you will likely cause them to erode away when flooding occurs. I began running the river in 1967. I have spent as many hours as anyone on the river, mainly from Pin Oak to Big Springs. Over the past 5 decades I have observed the changes to channels, river-banks, and gravel bars that occurred with each flood. I've likely seen every gravel bar that the floods created in that strip of river over the last 50 years. The newly formed gravel bars would stay for a while, sometimes for years or maybe decades, then they were washed away downstream to form new ones. Holes of water that used to be deep are now shallow, narrows are wider, wide holes are narrower, and places that used to be shallow are now deep. The river is constantly changing, always has, and always will, despite concrete, rip-rap, and regulations. In that cycle I can only think of very few gravel bars that have remained basically the same throughout all the years. The only gravel bars that have not at some point washed away are the gravel bars that received a lot of public use and accessed by vehicles; for instance, under the Van Buren bridge (it remained the same until they destroyed the usability by placing rock on the banks), and the Deer Run Gravel bars. It's a no-brainer that air inflated rubber tired vehicles, along with the foot traffic and day use, compacts the gravel and helps to hold it in place when flooding occurs.



Gravel Bar access for families is currently over restricted in the Van Buren section.

Already, in the Van Buren section of river no place exists for parents to take kids for a family day at the river, to enjoy swimming, fishing, and picnicking, on public owned lands. The ONSR already has the access points shut down or has changed the use to fee-camping or tube concession put-in and take-out. Several times, at both Raft Yard and Waymeyer, I have had gun toting people wearing badges tell me "that I had to hurry it on up and get my tubes and stuff unpacked in order to keep traffic flowing smoothly for the tube rentals." It seems the new regulations would regulate a way of life for the local people out of existence while promoting the tube concession and tourists' interests.

Studies do not show actual harm, or that possible future harm, will be prevented by the proposed regulations. Time, effort, energy, and the public's money should be spent to prevent the possibility of actual future harm occurring to the river.

Apparently, the management plans are in accordance with environmentalist's fantasy wishes to eradicate or limit all use of the Current River except those things important to the floating tourist. In a typical media slam of bald assertions and emotional appeal, Fay Augustyn, conservation associate for American Rivers, summed up their beliefs of what is important when she stated "everything that makes [the rivers] special - - their clean water and value to paddlers and anglers,"[1] which just like the management plans, does not include the local families' way of use. To those self-proclaimed conservationists, everything is only about the "value to the paddlers," in other words, "the floaters," and so are your management plans.

Actually, I believe the USGS Biological Science Report of 2005 shows that no harm is occurring due to current use,[2] so the ONSR should choose the no-action plan. However, addressing the "clean water" issue, it is a constant, underground fresh water supply that travels from many different unknown sources that feeds the river. Today's water will be in the muddy waters of Arkansas in a couple of days. Our waters are replaced daily with fresh spring-water. To prevent harm, locating possible risks of contamination to that underground water system makes sense; but shutting down some old trails and preventing a few local families enjoying a day along the river bank is absolute nonsense.

Also, the ONSR shows 1.3 million visitors come to the area. The amount of local people using gravel bars accessed by an old river-road is miniscule in relation to those 1.3 million "paddlers." Contrasting the possible harm between the two groups, the "paddlers" deposit tons of their human feces and urine directly into our river's water, and along our riverbanks, every summertime weekend. Those "paddlers" grind their feet into the river's gravel bottom hundreds of millions of times in a day, stirring up sediment (bad for the hellbenders), displacing gravel, and making the water dirty, not to mention the noise pollution, vulgarity, and drunken obscene lewdness they bring to the river, and is observed by the children.

Footnotes:

1. [http://www.joplinindependent.com/display\\_article.php/staff1305734460](http://www.joplinindependent.com/display_article.php/staff1305734460)

2. <http://www.cerc.usgs.gov/pubs/center/pdfdocs/BSR2001-0005.pdf>

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2007	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 15:38:33
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Park Supervisor Black,
------------------------	-----------------------------

I grew up in Missouri and spent countless hours on the Current, Black and Jacks Fork Rivers camping and canoeing. The time spent in quiet and peace and playing in the water was priceless.

I can tell you the first time my husband and I encountered all terrain vehicles churning up the river beds on the Current was possibly the worst day of our lives. Not only were these yahoos destroying the river and banks, but they purposely tried to sink our canoe. On the Current River you do not want to tip over and be in the water for any length of time due to the very cold spring fed pools. Not only were these idiots churning up the water but drunk to boot.

Small estuaries and fish habitat was ruined in less than a minute due to "their"Fun. I am not opposed to people having a good time, but I am opposed to being subjected to bullies on the river.

As years went by, my husband and I decided after a barrage of 4-wheelers we would no longer canoe on summer

weekends. We began canoeing during the week in the autumn, but unless we were willing to take vacation days, our time in the peace and quiet in the wild was extremely limited.

If canoeists pay fees to canoe, then its high time all terrain vehicles pay fees too and their intoxicated state should be a factor. There is nothing worse than a drunk on the river, in a 4-wheeler or canoe.

Please do not rescind National status to State status. Right now Missouri is bordering on extremists, not conservationists. It makes me ashamed that my home state that home rule no longer respects and cares for wildlife and wild river ways.

I worked for the Missouri Conservation Department 18 years ago for the STL Urban Biologist and was exposed to much beauty in Missouri, I would hate that our time of preservation will be lost if the federal government repeals the protection to our National waterways.

Sincerely,

Robin Howard

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2008    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 15:43:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO ACTION.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2009    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 15:48:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I want to go on record in support of Alternative A concerning the proposed Jacks Fork and Current river management plan. First , I need to explain that I am a native of the Ozarks having grown up paddling john boats on the Eleven Point river and then navigating it and the Current and Jacks Fork both by motorized john boat and canoe. I currently am on the rivers 30 or more days each year.

My concerns for protecting the resources we are blessed with are that they are still there in the pristene conditions that I have enjoyed for my children and grandchildren. I see the extensive unmanaged horse trails, vehicular access to gravel bars, and fewer restrictions on motors to be serious threats to maintaining water quality and the wilderness experience that should be preserved on the Riverways. The number of horses even allowed under Alternative A still presents possible serious erosion problems and fecal contamination. Of concern also is the number of unauthorized roads accessing the Riverways creating a number of problems from erosion to aesthetically degrading ones experience on the rivers. The use of motors above Akers can present dangerous situations in the more narrow corridor. There is plenty of river downstream for those wishing to use motorized boats.

Clearly, the rivers are subject to the effects of use by a larger number of people every year and to fulfill the Park Services goal of "preservation of the areas natural and wilderness qualities" restrictions on use must be enforced. I certainly realize that certain activities will be restricted but it is necessary for the future generations opportunity to enjoy what we have.

I also am in support of the Park Service working cooperatively with the Forest Service in protecting the area around Big Springs and recommend that it be designated Wilderness.

I recall the local feelings of distrust when the Eleven Point was designated a National Wild and Scenic River and had family and friends who were directly impacted. I also remember my father who had lived his entire life along the river stating his opinion that it was necessary to protect it from those who would destroy it simply for greed and profit.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2010    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 15:49:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO ACTION.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2011    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 15:56:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in support of the "no action alternative". I believe the current plan provides flexibility needed manage the resource in a fashion that protects the resource. Don't try to fix things to the point they are in fact broken.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2012 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 15:57:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Unfortunately, it only takes a few non caring, destructive people to ruin the natural beauty of our lands and rivers. This fact makes it a priority to impose rules.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2013 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 16:11:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Comment from a Senior Citizen

I worked my way thru college as a Staffer for KCMO Parks & Recreation at the resident camps in the 1960s. Every summer we took a staff canoe trip down the Current River - we paid our own way and it was terrific! I supported the Current River becoming part of the Ozark Waterways because I could see what was happening to it in later years. Dick Dawson and John Banghart (Parks & Rec) focused the KC resident camps (& the day camps) on an appreciation of nature and the joy that we could get by enjoying the state Parks. You don't need a lot of money to enjoy the MO park system.

The commercial recreational areas, such as the Lake of the Ozarks or Table Rock are nice, but can be replaced. We can build lakes. Look at Kansas - they have lakes all over the place, ... but no Current River! The peace that the Current River provides, especially for those of us who live in large urban areas, cannot be found on large lakes.

We need to keep the Current River (& therefore Ozark Waterways) protected from the impact of commercial needs. I would suggest the locals look at how commercial growth (& therefore money for them) can be made OUTSIDE the park. Their thinking is too narrow. They are not seeing the big opportunity for them. BUT, if they ruin the Park & the River, they have nothing!

I made a good living in the business world. Making money is great, but the Current River and the Ozark Waterways are there for everyone to enjoy not for the profit of a few, I don't care how long they have lived there. Living there does not give them the right to kill a MO treasure for their shortsighted advantage.

Please work to EXTEND this type of park.

Thanks for your work.

Pat Frost  
Webster Groves, MO

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2014 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 16:14:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a frequent and long time visitor of Roaring River, I have seen damage done to the land areas and river beds close to the river from horseback riders and all terrain vehicles. Most favorable to me with be Alternative A, but I would be somewhat satisfied with Alternative B. This would close the river crossings and horse trails in the immediate vicinity of the waterways and establish a permit system for horses. Opening a new learning and contact station, resuming the oral history of the area, and enhancing museum collections would be nice also. I do not favor a horse camp along the Jack Forks, as I feel this would lead to more pollution of the waterways and erosion of shore areas.

Pleas consider the pristine scenery and solitude of this area, without opening it to more visitors that would continue

to hurt the surrounding natural resources.

Thanks you for consideration of my thoughts. Judith Walker

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2015    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 16:22:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The National Park Service must act upon their responsibility to preserve the natural character of the Current and Jacks Fork watersheds. As a frequent volunteer in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways working under the auspices of the Cave Research Foundation I implore you to take this opportunity to create a management plan which will assure the continued protection of this spectacular place.

Currently water quality is threatened by overuse of horses. The National Park Service should close all unapproved trails and improve upon existing trails to limit stream crossings. In addition the number of horses allowed on park lands should be limited to prevent overuse and horses should be kept off of trails designed for human use.

Access points to the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers should also be limited which should include closing some access points currently used, oftentimes by myself. Vehicle access points contribute to erosion problems, take away from the wild character of the river, take away from the cultural heritage of the river, and allow individuals to abuse and trash areas with greater ease.

The National Park Service must also curb the use of motorboats on the rivers. The region is surrounded by both lakes and rivers for boaters to use their motorboats. There is no place in Missouri where one can experience the quiet of a river within a canoe and not feel intimidated by fast moving motorboats. You have the opportunity to create such a place on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. Jet boats are damaging to the aquatic environment, which you are charged with protecting. I am supportive of a ban on all motorboats with motors larger than were commonly used when the park was created, within park boundaries.

The National Park Service should also encourage the creation of more hiking trails and also encourage the use of mountain bikes. The local economy could also benefit by supporting an area which shows concern for a natural environment where users to go for recreation which does not threaten the natural and wild character this spectacular place. As we move into the 21 century I want to know that there are places here in Missouri for my son to appreciate when he grows older which will not have been degraded by horses, roadways and high power motorboats.

Dan Lamping

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2016    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 16:32:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of no new regulations, restrictions, or designations within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. As a local and a native of the area, I can assure you from experience that the people of this area have the best interest of the riverways at heart. There is a love, respect, and ownership interest in the rivers and surrounding areas that cannot be duplicated. I do see that the rivers can be overcrowded during the summer months, but that speaks to the beauty and attractiveness of the area. Locals will for the most part avoid busy summer weekends in favor of a more secluded setting during week days or off peak seasons. More regulation is not always better, which seems to be the mind set of our government these days. Let the people continue to hunt, fish, canoe, jet boat, hike, camp, site see, etc. without more rules and restrictions that we already have. Please listen to the people that live, work, and play here and do not cave in to special interest groups or even park service studies that think there is a better way. Thank you for considering my views.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2017    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 16:33:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Thank you to the NPS for your thorough study of the Management Plan options for the ONSR.

As a recreational canoeist of these rivers for over 30 years, I've become increasingly appalled as the natural area has been degraded by misuse and overuse. Overzealous local users and their abuse of current rules including unauthorized vehicle access, as well as the obnoxious Greek house party crowd have simply spoiled the experience for those seeking a quiet simple commune with the area's natural beauty and abundant wildlife and fisheries.

I am strongly in favor of option A. Option B would be a major improvement, but just isn't protective enough.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments in your decision-making process.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2018    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 16:38:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I prefer Alternative A. Once an area has been developed, there is no going back. I used to live near this area, and spent time canoeing the Current, Jack's Fork, and Eleven Point Rivers, among others, and also hiking in the woods.

Motorized watercraft and ATV's disturb the quiet for both wildlife and canoeists. Horses and ATV's pollute the rivers and degrade the trails. These distractions from the solitude of this natural area should be allocated to already disturbed areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2019    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

Missouri's riverways are a vital part to the ecosystems of the surrounding areas and are home to a vast variety of wildlife. I support Alternative B because it allows both, people and wild life to coexist. Alternative B allows both to benefit.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2020    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 16:42:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Plan B. I love the waterways and want to see them preserved and appreciated. Thank you.

Dr. Goodman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2021    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 16:43:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No Action

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2022    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 16:52:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.
- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.
- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.
- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.
- Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

Sincerely,  
Jerre Miller  
Willow Springs, MO 65793  
jerrem@centurylink.net

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2023    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 16:58:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO ACTION!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2024    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 17:01:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have read the Draft General Management Plan in its entirety and attended the public meeting in St. Louis. I have the following comments:

1. You give us three alternatives: A, B or C. However, there are no specifics as to what trails you plan to close but you mention that you know how many miles of trails will be closed. So you do know what you plan to do. It is impossible to give an opinion when you do not know the specifics. The plan seems to give the Park Service carte blanche. When I asked questions at the meeting, I was given the answer "we may or may not" with no definitive response as to trail closings. They stated it just gave the Park Service the powers to close off trails if they thought it was needed and we would have not input on those closings. My choice would be the No-Action alternative and continue as is with no changes. My reasons are listed below.

2. The regulations that are in effect today give the Park Service the ability to control the lands; and in my opinion, they do not need to further regulate the recreational use of the area. Instead the Park Service should utilize the regulations they currently have in effect and allow everyone to enjoy the park. It was designated as a park for all Americans to enjoy and our tax dollars are paying for it. I do not think you can close off portions of the Park to some and not allow them to enjoy its beauty. I have travelled to this area for recreation (i.e. trail riding, canoeing, camping, swimming, tubing, hiking) since 1963. I will tell you that I do not see that much difference in the Rivers since that time. They complain that the horse trails are damaging the environment. This is the tactic that is continually used to try and keep all horses out of the area.

3. My further concern, if you go ahead with any of these alternatives, is the effect it will have on the small businesses and towns located in the area. For instance, the citizens of Eminence survive on the canoeing, camping and CCTR trailriders. Without that income, the locals will not be able to survive and will wind up on welfare. Your report already shows there is a high percentage of the locals on welfare. I have seen the economy take a downturn and businesses in the area close their doors. More regulations and control on the Park will destroy these towns and families.

4. Water quality is one of the big issues raised by some groups. However, contrary to what the Sierra Club puts out, the horses are not causing the e-coli issue. As I have said before in the public meetings, they need to look at the leaching of septic systems in the area.

5. There is a concern on how this will be funded. The government has already cut spending and funding to the Park Service. You have less manpower in the Park. Why do we continue to pay for additional plans when that money could be better spent on correcting some of the erosion issues and general welfare of the Park.

6. The Park was initially designated as a "Federal recreation area". This plan wants to limit the recreation use. I do not feel that the original Committee would agree to the Alternatives in your Plan and straying away from its original use. To designate areas as "primitive" and limit their access does not comply with the Park's original use.

I attended the meetings when they tried to change things several years ago and the general consensus was to leave things alone. Why does the Park Service continue to spend our tax dollars on new plans when everyone agreed back then that it should stay the same?

Maybe you should attend one of the CCTR rides in June or October and talk to the people and get their input. I doubt that most people know about this Plan since they attend from all over the United States. This is not a Missouri issue. Requiring permits to utilize the Parks is very limiting. When you start controlling numbers and timeframes that the Park can be accessed, it limits the Park's use and original intent.

I love this area and hope that the government does not try to overregulate its use and destroy the enjoyment of its citizens with too much bureaucracy. As I said earlier, I have been travelling to this area since 1963 for recreational purposes several times a year, the Park is still pristine and the current regulations seem to be working.

My hope is that the Park Service will not be influenced by the lobbying efforts of the Sierra Club and will consider the comments from other recreational users and the locals before closing off this area to our use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2025    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 17:03:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As an avid hiker and nature photographer, I have been blessed to visit all 48 continental states and 2/3 of Canada. Our wonderful state has so much to offer the outdoors person and those who are being introduced to nature. Missouri State Parks are second to none and I applaud those who do such a great job of managing these parks and historical areas on a shoestring budget. Unfortunately, it has been my experience that many of the scars and much of the abuse in and around these areas is the result of locals, not visitors. The latter group may be more environmental conscious and do not take these gifts from nature for granted. With these thoughts and concerns in mind, I support the MPA's support for "B" and funding the efforts outlined in this proposition at the same level "A" and "C" are designed to receive. Thank you.

Marvin E. Beard

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2026    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 17:10:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a former resident of Missouri, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is a national treasure that deserves to be enhanced and maintained for future generations to enjoy. While all should have access to this resource, it is imperative to maintain and improve the environmental quality that makes it attractive and valuable. My interest and that of my family when we visit Missouri is to see the natural wildlife and flora that can only flourish if the habitat is protected. Thus we support Alternative A as the preferred management plan for this area, although we would be willing to accept Alternative B as a reasonable compromise. Alternative C is not acceptable, nor is any attempts by local interests to allow unlimited access by environmentally destructive practices. It is critical to protect the shoreline of the riverway from erosion and to give this area a chance to be protected for many years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2027    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 17:29:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm very disappointed to here what you are trying to do with our trails along the Current River. I remember about 14 years ago riding with my 2 year old granddaughter in front of me in the saddle. The things she said to me like grandma I didn't know horses could walk on water. She would touch the leaves as we where riding and she'd tell me what she felt. Some of the best times of my life and my granddaughters. I remember picking berry with her and one of the other granddaughter. These where good memory for them and me. I would like this to be there for there children also. This is clean and educational times for these children, it help them learn about nature and wild life. I've always taught them that what we go out with on the trails comes back with us, we never throw anything on the ground. Even candy wrappers. Please thing of what you are doing to our children and us trail riders. We trully enjoy the trails.

I believe you are missing out on a good opportunity at Cedar Grove you have a well there for water now. The state on Kansas has camping for horses there and have charges for this, which brings money into there state to help with maintence on there trails and there parks. I thing you need to check this out.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2028    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 17:46:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am very concerned about the issue of permits for trail riding mentioned in the general management plan. As a current CUA holder, the plan does make it clear whether our guests will be required to buy a permit in addition to the permit we are required to have. I feel that this would be charging our guests double and that it would be unfair to both them and our business.

In regard to the trail closures, I understand the need to close trails that are in need of maintenance due to erosion or other issues. However, the plan is very broad which is very concerning since we are given a different superintendent



about every year and a half. This leaves a lot of space for changes depending on the current superintendent and gives very little hope of any consistency in decision making. I would like to encourage the park to seriously consider making additions to the trail system to offset any closures they may make.

Although the suggested zoning for motor boats will not impact our business directly, it will have a personal impact. I feel that the limits and zones proposed in the plan are already enforced by the river itself. The water level in the river takes care of most of the zoning proposed. The zoning would limit some areas that are traditionally used during gigging season. Motor boats are rarely in these areas due to low water levels, which seems to make the regulation unneeded. I would like the zoning areas to be reviewed and possibly revised to allow the local people to continue gigging as has been done for 100 years.

Thank you very much for your time. I appreciate the opportunity to express my views.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2029    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 18:12:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The rivers are the reason my family and I moved to Eminence, Mo. We love the outdoors and boat riding on the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2030    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 18:26:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No Action.

My response is no action so that the riverways, etc all remain in the state of Missouri and under LOCAL use, etc.

Wendy Wildt

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2031    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 18:29:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** In regards to TABLE 4. MOTORBOAT HORSEPOWER (HP) LIMITS BY ALTERNATIVE, most individuals that live just South of the Southern most Scenic River Way Border, currently own and operate motors larger than 60/40. I typically launch my boat at the end of Junction E in Carter County or at Bay Nothing in Ripley County. My Wife, Father-in-law, and myself, do most of our fishing North up the river toward Big Springs. Downsizing motor limits would prevent many Residents from having the opportunity to enjoy the Scenic River Ways without causing financial strains on buying new boats and outboards and selling current boats and outboards. Although we have a larger motor, we primarily fish and provide relatives with site seeing tours up the river. Horsepower limits between these points will cause more hardship than good for county residents and businesses.

I request not to have a Horsepower limit from Big Springs down to the Southern Border and that the vote goes for the No-action Alternative.

Much appreciation for your time,

Michael Cambron

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2032    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 18:44:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** no action should be taken.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2033    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2034 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 18:57:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Since 1970 I have been a canoeist and have enjoyed the beauty of many rivers, especially, the Current River. Times and people have changed, but I fear for the worst for our rivers if we do not take a stand on the proposed General Management Plan

I have noticed the gravel bars are becoming more crowded and people are camping closer to the river as they can get to the gravel bars with 4 wheel drive vehicles. I am especially disturbed by the horses that are allowed in the river and so close to it. The power boats are also a disruption in my search for quiet nature. They do not seem to slow down or be concerned with others in sharing the river.

So much over use and we will not have a scenic waterway.

I am asking you to support Plan A as this seems to protect and preserve the river in a state that more resembles wild and scenic.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2035 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 18:58:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We have been enjoying the scenic river ways of current river and white river for many many years. We have pulled campers and rented cabins at both locations and have enjoyed with our family the peace and tranquility and the natural beauty of the areas around the rivers. We currently own property on both river ways and have been dishearten to hear of the termoil the federal government has brought to these areas. In my opinion the federal government should leave matters to the state government. Tourism in these areas are very important to the survival of the communities that surround the river ways. We are middle class people and use these locations as our vacation spots and hope we can continue to enjoy with our family and friends these areas that are close to home.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2036    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 19:19:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to voice my support for management plan alternative B. I would like to see an increase in designated wilderness areas within the park boundaries. I would also like to see a reduction of motorized traffic within park boundaries, both terrestrial and on the waterways. I am also concerned about the effects of the increased equestrian use and suggest that a permit system be used to set limits.

The lack of sanitary facilities is contributing to water quality degradation by canoeists. I would like to see canoe outfitters be required to supply temporary, seasonal, portable outhouses at put-ins and take-outs and improved signage for existing facilities. The addition of educational postings to inform river users of the importance of proper sanitation methods would be helpful. I support closure of illegal roads and barring vehicle access to gravel bars to limit destruction of fragile river ecosystems.

I supported the National Park Service when it was establishing the Ozark National Scenic Riverway and think they have done an excellent job managing the riverways over the past 20 years. I believe that the National Park Service's suggested alternative B, developed by professional wildlife managers is the best choice.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2037    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 19:20:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO ACTION!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2038    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 19:22:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides

opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

Sincerely

Travis Bailey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2039    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 19:42:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We want to keep the trails at Eminence and surrounding areas open to the public. I have a disability due to a stroke 7 years ago but with the help of friends and my horse, I am able to see beautiful scenery which would not be possible if you restrict the area. We always are careful to never leave trash anywhere we go. If we take it in, we bring it out. We are very protective of this area. We have been visiting the area at least annually for many years and do not want to see it become more restricted, which is why we are advocating the no-action alternative plan.

Jim and Velma Sutterer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2040    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 19:45:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As college students and young adults we took canoe trip weekends on a yearly basis. as older adults my family went on a three generatin float. Things were different but it was a great experience. Please keep thr rivers free and clean for the future genertion. Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2041    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 19:49:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It is very, very important that we have plenty of designated horseback riding trails in our beautiful State. My husband and I have spent many, many hours over the last 25 years riding horses. We got our two children involved in riding and now have our grandchildren riding and camping with us. There is no better way to teach our children the importance of being responsible for the animal you are riding and the land upon which you are riding that horse. EACH AND EVERY TIME we ride we pick up trash and clip the trails. The kids know this and still love the idea of riding along the trails, verses riding dirt roads, etc. God has created so much beauty for us to see. It's important that we experience all of God's creation and not so much man-made things. Please, consider all of the above, I beg you.

Vicky Raymond

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2042    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 20:00:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been struggling with how to express my views about the proposed ONSR General Management Plan because I have friends who have strong opinions on both sides of the issue. I think that both sides have more in common than they realize: we all want to enjoy the natural beauty that makes up the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. These rivers are very special, and they deserve to be protected: we don't want to "love" them to death. Both sides need to find a middle ground where they can meet. While the local users certainly have rights to enjoy "their" river, it is ALSO a national treasure and a national park, and belongs to all.

In general, I support the Park preferred alternative B plan, but with some adjustment. I understand why many local folks object to it. No one wants to see their favorite access to the river closed down, but the reality is that we don't need access roads to every gravel bar along every mile of the river. There should be some gravel bars in any given

stretch that are accessible only by boat, as well as some gravel bars that are accessible for vehicle camping. I do not believe that folks should be able to drive ATV's to any gravel bar they wish, nor do I want to see ATV's in the river.

Alternative B closes a portion of both rivers to motorized boats. While I agree that it would be nice to have a section reserved for a quieter experience, I see no reason to restrict those motorized boats in the winter months, when many locals like to use their motorboats for gigging fish. I don't think there are many folks canoeing or kayaking from November to mid March, and I see no reason to keep motorboats out during those winter months. I have kayaked the popular Two Rivers to Powder Mill section in November, January and in February, and each time I have seen very few boats of any type.

Many folks who come from the city to enjoy the riverways are looking for a quiet escape from urban and suburban life. Those of us who are lucky enough to live in Shannon County are blessed to be able to experience this quiet natural beauty on a daily basis, and we should understand that others deserve the chance to experience it even if only briefly. When they come to the riverways to experience this, the jet boat that zooms up and down the river destroys the quiet they are seeking.

Some visitors to our riverways are not seeking quiet, but instead are seeking a party atmosphere: they want to drink and/or do drugs and listen to loud music as they float in a tube or a canoe. As they get drunker, they get louder, and may yell obscenities. Neither the local users nor the visitors seeking quiet natural beauty benefit from such behavior. There are party-type rivers in private ownership, and I would suggest that party goers should go to those rivers for their recreation. That sort of behavior doesn't belong in our national park. Our rangers need to enforce current regulations against this behavior. I also support the proposed change from a restriction on the number of canoes in any given stretch to a restriction on the number of ALL vessels (tubes, canoes, kayaks, motorboats, etc). Congestion on the river is unsafe, takes away from the quality river experience, and threatens the natural resource.

I've heard locals express their concern that the Park Service is only asking for comments because it is required as part of the planning process. They believe that NPS will do what it wants to do, regardless of what the comments might say. There certainly is precedence for this belief: the use of eminent domain to obtain the land for the park eroded much of the trust of local people. I would suggest that NPS would be well served to establish a working group that includes key players within each of the major constituent groups. The group should be small (for most effective operation), but should include people with differing viewpoints who are willing to roll up their sleeves and work together to achieve a plan that will be as fair as it can be to all the constituents while still protecting the resource. Such a group would go a long way toward constituent "buy-in" and ownership of the resulting plan. For example, if trail riders are involved in deciding which horse trails are damaging to the resource (and should thus be closed or improved), they will be more likely to understand and abide by these decisions.

One concern is that NPS funding has been uncertain of late. Although it sounds good to close down undesignated horse trails and build well designed horse trails instead, where will the funds to construct these new trails come from? I would propose that NPS wait to close down all but the worst of the undesignated trails until they have funding in place to construct replacement trails. When it IS time to build or improve trails, it would be best to work closely both with trail riders themselves as well as ecologists dedicated to protecting the resource. A successful trail will be one that riders can safely enjoy, yet does minimal damage to the resource. Trail riding is a large economic driver for the area. We need to find the best compromise to both encourage tourism while also working to protect the fragile river resource. Canoeists and kayakers also contribute greatly to the economy of the region, but too many of them can also cause problems for the resource.

In closing, I'd like to make a plea for us all to think about what we all have in common, rather than falling in to an "us against them" stance. We all love these rivers, and we ALL own them, from local residents to St. Louis or Kansas City residents to someone in Wyoming who might come to visit for a week. The rivers need to be managed in such a way that we can all enjoy them without endangering the special resource that we all love so much.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2043	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 20:04:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I am an equestrian user (trail rider) that rides horses and loves the ONSR. I also float, hike, and sight see with my family. I have been riding horses along the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers since 1976. I am a

conservationist and am interested in preserving the history of the area and the quality of the water in the rivers and streams. I offer this introduction to inform the reader that this is not a one-sided comment to the draft plan.

The Options A, B, and C are a nice gesture. Given the size of the national park and the many different users of the area, it is hard to have a one size, fits all aproach.

My initial comment is that, as a trail rider, there should be many trails designated for equestrian use in the National Park. Having just a handful of linear trails will concentrate equestrians and foster frustration that leads to those few users that will "create their own" trails, which is a current problem in the ONSR (and many other areas), not endorsed by most trailriders, and is part of a big problem. The same issue does exist with the hiking and mountain biking community, but is an acknowledged problem with a few trailriders that tends to give the whole a bad appearance. Having many equestrian designated trails and looping trails will help this problem. Also, having multiple accesses to stream and river crossings will prevent those aforementioned "do it yourselfer trailblazers" from making their own way to water. Horses and pack stock need water, and a lot of it, especially in the spring and summer months. It is not recreational, it is a necessity. Again, only having one river/stream access every 5 miles is going to cause problems because we are watering animals, not looking for a recreational swimming hole.

Finally, the Show Me Missouri Backcountry Horsemen can be a really useful asset for the NPS to draw advice from for equestrian user trails and information. They not a local saddle club... they are a trail ethics group and knowledgable for issues that are unforeseen by nontrailriders. A nationwide organization recognized by the Forest Service, BLM, NPS, MDNR, and MDC, the SMMBCH organization stands for quality trails for all users, not only equestrians.

In conclusion, individual items from Options A, B, and C are great. Please consider many trails designated for equestrian use with numerous access sites to fresh water. Trailhead access capable of multiple vehicles and trailers, and looping trails to prevent a few users who don't abide by most laws from making their own trails.

Thank you for your time concerning this sensative issue.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2044    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 20:07:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO ACTION

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2045    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 20:10:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Sirs:

It is important that we have multiple trails with several trailheads to enable several horseback riders on the trails without causing erosion and not be riding on top of each other. Also it is important that the trails have access to water as the horses will need to have water available for drinking. These trails should allow the riding to have multiple options verses the one way in, turn around and ride the same way back out. As a park service owned by the public the trails should be available for public use.

Thank you for your consideration.

Leroy Raymond

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2046    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 20:12:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 1. The information gathering 3-4 years ago was flawed from the beginning. At the meeting in Salem, the rangers from the ONSR were not availabe for discussion regarding the information to be discussed and provided for input into the management plan alternatives. The NPS had rangers from other districts in attendance.

Those rangers knew very little about the ONSR.

2. The perceptions need to be based on facts, not perceptions. If there is an excess of access points, then the present ones need to be identified, marked and reviewed for closure with the notations where and how the remaining access points will be maintained.

3. The alternatives note that "historical significance" of the area is to be a part of the plan. How does NPS expect to provide this when NPS already pulled those services from regular programs offered by NPS? Will Congress suddenly fund programs specifically because they are in the management plan?

4. ONSR tends to get a superintendent who is scheduled to retire in a year or two from the time of his/her appointment. Would be nice to have a Superintenden for 6-7 years who is looking forward to a long career as a Ranger rather than looking forward to retirement.

5. If District offices are going to dictate what happens in ONSR, then those persons should be made to visit more frequently so they get a full understanding of the ONSR activity.

6. The ONSR was created as a recreational park, not a natural or historic park. With that in mind, the park needs to be managed as such.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2047    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 20:13:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am an equestrian user (trail rider) that rides horses and loves the ONSR. I also float, hike, and sight see with my family. I have been riding horses along the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers since 1976. I am a conservationist and am interested in preserving the history of the area and the quality of the water in the rivers and streams. I offer this introduction to inform the reader that this is not a one-sided comment to the draft plan.

The Options A, B, and C are a nice gesture. Given the size of the national park and the many different users of the area, it is hard to have a one size, fits all aproach.

My initial comment is that, as a trail rider, there should be many trails designated for equestrian use in the National Park. Having just a handful of linear trails will concentrate equestrians and foster frustration that leads to those few users that will "create their own" trails, which is a current problem in the ONSR (and many other areas), not endorsed by most trailriders, and is part of a big problem. The same issue does exist with the hiking and mountain biking community, but is an acknowledged problem with a few trailriders that tends to give the whole a bad appearance. Having many equestrian designated trails and looping trails will help this problem. Also, having multiple accesses to stream and river crossings will prevent those aforementioned "do it yourselfer trailblazers" from making their own way to water. Horses and pack stock need water, and a lot of it, especially in the spring and summer months. It is not recreational, it is a necessity. Again, only having one river/stream access every 5 miles is going to cause problems because we are watering animals, not looking for a recreational swimming hole.

Finally, the Show Me Missouri Backcountry Horsemen can be a really useful asset for the NPS to draw advice from for equestrian user trail needs and information. They not a local saddle club... they are a trail ethics group and knowledgable for issues that are unforeseen by nontrailriders. A nationwide organization recognized by the Forest Service, BLM, NPS, MDNR, and MDC, the SMMBCH organization stands for quality trails for all users, not only equestrians.

In conclusion, individual items from Options A, B, and C are great. Please consider many trails designated for equestrian use with numerous access sites to fresh water. Trailhead access capable of multiple vehicles and trailers, and looping trails to prevent a few users who don't abide by most laws from making their own trails.

Thank you for your time concerning this sensative issue.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2048    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 20:18:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No Action

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2049 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 20:21:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have several questions and would like to comment on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Draft General Management Plan.

"Alternative B" is the plan recommended by the National Park Service. Can you tell me why we will need 26 new full-time park rangers and a \$6.7 million, one-time cost, new facility to house the additional park rangers? If we are closing all the river access points and closing all the roads and trails, why do we need more park rangers? Are they needed to enforce all the new regulations on us local folks? On second thought, maybe the National Park Service underestimated the size of the new facility they will need.

For generations, the folks in this area have been good stewards of these rivers and we have taken good care of them. These rivers were originally given to the federal government to create the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, so that everyone would have access to the rivers. I would like to see the Ozark National Scenic Riverways be returned to the Missouri Department of Conservation and our Missouri Department of Natural Resources. Our Missouri State Park Division is in a much better position to maintain and operate the Scenic Riverways as they were intended. They are in a much better position to consider the needs of the local people.

I strongly recommend that my state and federal representatives support the No-Action Alternative to the Draft General Management Plan and work to bring our rivers back under state control.

Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2050 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 20:23:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The most desirable aspect of Alternative A, is the limitation of motorized boats on the riverways.

While I appreciate the limits put on horsepower, the advent of jet-drive propulsion permits boats to travel in shallow waters previously off limits to prop driven boats. Further, once in these shallower waters, the captain of jet-propelled vessels must maintain a high rate of speed to reduce the draft of the boat and thus keep it from being grounded on the gravel bar. This situation happened to me as a 16 foot boat raced by me within 4 feet of my Kayak. He was not about to ground his boat. I couldn't paddle out of the way fast enough.

Jet propelled boats and slower moving tubes, rafts, kayaks and swimmers do not belong in the same area especially during peak season.

For this reason I support Alternative A.

Thanks,  
Bob

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2051 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 20:39:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the plan preferred by the NPS. I am a native of Shannon County and a current property owner in Dent County about 5 miles from the National Scenic Riverways. The Current River requires greater NPS involvement and support. The number of summer tourists floating the river on Saturdays makes floating very unpleasant for locals like my family. In addition, many horseback riders cross the river causing lots of horse manure to pollute the river. Better planning and horseback trails which do not involve crossing the river would be



great! I often pass "Flying W" when canoes are stopped there to swim in great numbers. There are often horseback riders there as well. I am very glad when I see a NPS officer there. It seems like a high risk situation for fights when so many swimmers who have often consumed too much alcohol see horses pooping in their swimming hole. I appreciate the NPS protecting this river which I have loved my entire life. I applaud the NPS efforts to improve their control over the National Scenic Riverways and preserve this wonderful area for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2052    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 20:39:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Alternative B (NPS Preferred) seems to be (from trying to analyze the exhausting data provided) the choice we most likely could see some benefit from as we spend many hours and thousands of dollars to come enjoy and volunteer to help preserve the beauty of the Ozark National Riverways Areas on horseback. I grew up camping and floating the riverways and it was on one of our family float-trips I discovered a horse camp and soon I was hauling horses to the area also. After I married; my husband (we met on a trail ride in the ONSR) we have brought our children and grandchildren to the ONSR on numerous combination volunteer trail maintenance/vacations. We have spent over 20 years riding in this area and have been members of Show-Me-Missouri Back Country Horsemen members since its formation. I have read and not understood the comments some have posted on wanting to keep horses from crossing the river. If horses are prohibited from crossing and drinking and cooling themselves at the river's edge I promise you a HUGE economic impact will result from that decision as the river is the draw for horsemen as ourselves. We might as well go ride in Arizona if the riverways are made into a desert and the refreshing waters of the ONSR are inaccessible from horseback. It has been our observation from many hours spent collecting trash on the trails from horseback that we find the trash is predominately on the trails that are accessible by motorized vehicles. We do find some on the river's edge also which we assume most is deposited there accidentally from canoes that have capsized and the contents of the canoe were washed downriver and lost. Rarely we do find large amounts left intentionally and what we do find we attribute to the open container laws and underage drinking. One more thing I would like to add is horses are used for people who would otherwise be unable to enjoy the beauty of the riverways by a physical handicap. I myself am limited physically by an artificial joint replacement and if it was not for my horse would no longer be able to enjoy the beauty of God's creation by my own power. As I have been very physically active in outdoor activities all of my life the ability to ride my horse and still enjoy the trails and riverways is very important to my health mentally and keeps me actively engaged in enjoying outdoor recreational activities. Thank you in advance for your time and I hope my comments help to preserve, protect, and advance opportunities for all to enjoy the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Sincerely and with much thought, Anna Patton

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2053    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 20:49:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No Change. I feel this for the following 4 reasons:

1. When I started to hear about the proposed management plans, my number one concern was that hunting, trapping and fishing would continue as it has for decades on the current and Jack's Fork rivers. Those sports are shown as continuing in table 5, page 49, of the summary of key excerpts, but the plan also talks about plans to close roads and prevent motor boats on the river. If roads are closed and motor boat restrictions are put in place, this will deny access of the public and take away something that many people have used for decades and generations. Closures will interfere with those individuals' rights to hunt, trap and fish.

2. The language of the plan is very ambiguous and vague. As an example, when talking about the road closures, NPS know how many miles of roads they plan to close, but will not say which roads are targeted to be closed. This vague language makes me suspicious that a hidden agenda is being covered up. Vague language is a way special interest groups can deceive their true agenda. Closing roads would tend to effect the local people probably more than those who drive 150 miles to rent a canoe for a float trip. By closing certain roads, I fear that river access may only be through NPS fee based entrances.

3. I attended the Jan 23 meeting at Powder Valley. At one of the stops there was a discussion about Pothole Rd. An individual mentioned how he had used it for many years and now there were all kinds of vehicles on that road and new trails by ATV's at many locations along the road. Those are the illegal roads I suppose mentioned by NPS they

want to close. I think this person was in favor of alternative B.

The other side of the discussion stemmed from the fact that Pothole Rd had been maintained by NPS for many years. Several years ago, NPS stopped maintaining it and even rejected the local county's offer to maintain it. Had NPS maintained that road, and probably others like it, there would have been no need to look for other routes to the river. Above all, had that road been maintained, then NPS should have enforced the off road activity. Lack of enforcement of destructive ATV use on sand bars, or excessive use on unmaintained roads, does not warrant a whole new plan, but should require the NPS to enforce the existing laws.

I hear people complain about the boats on the river and how they often interfere with floaters. How the boat is operated has nothing to do with the size of the motor, but has everything to do with the operator at the controls. If a boat is going too fast and conflicting with floaters that operator needs to be ticketed. In the same light, if a lot of floaters are blocking the river, such that a motor boat cannot pass, they should be told to disperse so the boat can pass.

4. Demographics: As I listened to the comments on Jan 23 in Kirkwood, there were distinct opposites of opinion. I was surprized how many people attended from the area around the Current and Jack Fork rivers and the counties around them. I think everyone who identified themselves as being from that area, including elected officials, recommended "no change." I think all but two speakers that said they were from St Louis, or the suburbs, were in favor of the alternative A or B.

As I drove home, it became obvious that the NPS plan has separated the locals wanting no change and the urban people in favor of an alternative. My concern is that it appears to be a local vs. urban issue. I use these numbers strictly as an example; if 500 local people send in no change comments and 1000 urban people comment in favor of alternative B, the 500 are a lot larger percent of the local population and the 1000 are a lot smaller percent of the urban population. I hope the NPS realizes this and takes this into consideration. If the NPS said we had more support for alternative B and that is what we will go with, even though it is a smaller percent of the population that would not be fair or right to the local people.

#### Summary:

I think the "No change" alternative should be adopted and the NPS plan put on hold. I beleive a good plan is one that has more concensus from all sides than I currently see in any of the proposed alternatives. I think both sides agree with the enabling legislation of recreation, conservation and preservation. I would like to see the NPS develop an educational program that addresses these three areas and how they interact. Education should also focus on which practices are - and are not - allowed; eg: ATV use areas, river etiquette, motorized limits, appropriate trail usage, leave no trace principles, etc. Follow education with stronger enforcement and further legislation should not be necessary.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2054	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 20:49:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** We need prop.D for no changes...When there's an accident on the river, who saves them {boaters} who takes the tourist to the closest access point {LOCALS} in there 40/60 boats.. If the park rangers, or conservation agents are on the rivers, they are {hiding in the bushes} trying to get pictures of tourist using the facilities. There are old grave yard all up and down these rivers, we need to keep these open for public access. What about handicap parking for elderly and wheel chairs. What about discovery ministries, why can't they place canoes on the weekends on the rivers? They pay Fed Taxes too. They only have 12 canoes. DISCRIMINATION IS WHAT WE CALL IT. What about Baptisms in the river, who do we have to call on GOD above? Now they say the park quit reading the upper Jacks Fork River for flood control? Is this true? Because of the cost of an upper river flood control reader, hire a high school person! Where did the 1969 park bylaws go? Maybe we need to bring those back out in the new General Management Plan, this new one sucks.. This G M P plan has no place in Shannon, Dent, Carter. We choose a new state park, or D N R Park.. These are just setup to kill out our little towns. Why don't you count the amount of tubes floating the lower current river.. How many times a day do they rent those tubes every Saturday? What happened to the high school work programs, they fixed spring branches, hiking trails, cut grass, paint, stain bridges.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2055	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 21:04:49				

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** No Action!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2056    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 21:05:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have fond memories of canoeing on Missouri Rivers in the Ozarks and don't want future generations to miss out on that opportunity!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2057    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 21:37:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Each time plans like this one are placed on the books it takes a little more of our (and Your Freedom as well) freedom away, never to be returned. It amazes me how some in our country can embrace the doctrines of Lennon!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2058    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 21:37:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a Missouri resident and longtime floater on the Ozark Scenic Waterways I urge the department to protect this precious jewel with the most conservative management system possible. After reviewing the options, I most certainly endorse Option A as the most desirable option in keeping the rivers and surrounding area pristine and natural for generations to come. However, I also understand that folks in the local areas rely on the income from tourism to make a living. Therefore, I would also accept option B as a compromise to allow for more staff to supervise the land use and manage this beautiful resource for generations to come. I urge the department to drop option C, which, on the face of it, would have disastrous and irreversible consequences for the rivers we so love, and are protecting for our children's children.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2059    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 22:51:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have visited the springs and rivers, gone rafting and enjoyed many hours in the pristine beauty of the Ozarks. Please stop all degradation of the area. Cycling, other harmful vehicles such as four wheel drive and all kinds of motorized use should be banned. Keep vehicles out of the area. Walking to the beauty spots will also, perhaps, help reduce obesity!

Sincerely

Sr. Renee Brinker

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2060    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 23:52:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I was just 5 years old on my first trip to the Current River. That would have been in 1963! I remember it well because I got in trouble. My parents let me go down to the river on my own while they finished getting my brothers ready for a swim, but I had to promise not to get in the water until they got there. I remember they had just told me what the word "current" meant, and I was curious to see what they were talking about. I barely stuck my toe in the river, and wouldn't you know, I lost my flip flop to the current in a flash. I was busted, and I knew it.

I have had the pleasure to camp along side and float the Current River and the Jack's Fork on several occasions over the intervening fifty years. I have lived in Missouri my entire life, and I love to spend time in this part of our state. I am sad to say I have seen many abuses that come with popularity of these two streams. I think the new policy restricting alcohol on the river was a great move, and seems to be helping.

The work of the National Park Service to study the issues of overuse and abuse, and to develop alternate

management plans is admirable, and it is essential to protect these jewels for future generations. I appreciate the opportunity to make comment on the various plans.

The agency's preferred plan, Alternate B, would certainly lead to an improvement in several areas, and I see it is an attempt to balance some of the competing interests that must be considered. However, in my opinion, Alternate A is more likely to truly save a threaten wilderness.

Thanks again for the work that you do, and thanks for considering my view.

Sincerely,  
Mark Zacher

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2061	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Black:				

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation ofâ€the Current River and Jacks Fork Riverâ€its free-flowing streamsâ€springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.
- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.
- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.
- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.
- Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Sincerely,

E M Knight

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2062    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 05:17:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I do not favor futhur regulations and restrictions on the watershed surrounding the Riverway. Those people who live there are already burdened with the demands of actually living in remote areas, and desire only to be left alone to care for their property as they see fit. Our mountians are a DYNAMIC environment with abundant rain, low population, temperate climate, native forrests,and a karst topography that filters water resources.

The last thing our environment needs is more Federal regulations which may be based on real science or just politically inspired pseudo-environmentalism.

My input is for the Park Service to do nothing for now, and take no action to restrict land owners from developing their property as they see fit ot to place more restrictions on occasional users that serve no real purpose.

Sincerely,

William Albert Pierce, Eldridge, MO

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2063    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 05:28:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO RESPONSE!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2064    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 06:06:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2065    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 06:54:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I've ridden horses all of my life, not only in Missouri but in many other states. Horseback riders contribute a lot of revenue to the state of Missouri by taxes on their vehicles and trailers, on the horses themselves. We buy feed and medicine and employ people as our farriers. I believe it is as important to provide places for us to ride our horses as it is for hunters, and further believe we can share those areas with them. Our horses need access to water when we ride, we need trailheads to park our trucks and trailers. The more places you

provide for us to ride with spread out the use and not over-use or congest one park over another.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2066    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2067    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I visit this spectacular area often, and I've brought friends from as far away as California to enjoy this area, camp in the parks, and shop in the local community. This area is rare and beautiful and in need of our careful stewardship if it is to survive. Please help to preserve this special place.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as

proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

Sincerely,  
Jan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2068    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 07:42:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe there should be no changes. I reject all the new management plans.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2069    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 07:46:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to voice my support for management plan alternative B. I support a reduction of motorized traffic within park boundaries, both motor vehicles and motor boats. There is a lot of illegal access to the river and I personally have been subjected to harassment from ATV riders driving through my campsite at high speeds deliberately antagonizing campers and canoers. I have watched trucks and ATVs drive through the river on illegal cut throughs with no concern for destruction of the river, banks or gravel bars. I have canoed alongside very responsible, respectful motorboaters as well as others traveling at unsafe high speeds with no regard for other boaters or swimmers.

Me, my family and friends have canoed, camped and hiked on the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers for generations. We support the canoe liveries, restaurants and other local businesses. We have owned property in the Salem area and paid taxes for decades.

Missouri is blessed with these pristine, natural gems, the Jacks and the Current are world class rivers. This is a source of pride and income for citizens of Missouri, it should be protected and treasured not exploited and destroyed by ignorant, uncaring citizens who put personal pleasure over a future of continued beauty and wildlife.

I support plan B because it is apparent that increased regulation is required to care for our natural resources in a way that benefits everyone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2070    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 08:01:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe the Alternative B plan would be the best way to protect our river ways. Please protect our beautiful natural areas.  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2071 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 08:03:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Ozark Scenic Riverway is an international treasure, both for its diversity of plant and animal life and for humans. The pristine beauty and quiet of a natural wilderness soothes the human spirit. In this era of global warming we must protect our natural resources, and support biological diversity. yet we can do so in a way that people can still enjoy the outdoors. Thus, I support a balanced use proposal, with reasonable limits on overuse and noise and environmental pollutants. Supporting our natural resources also creates jobs. I implore you to save the Ozark Scenic Riverway.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2072 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 08:08:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I HAVE ENJOYED FLOATING TRIPS ON THE RIVERS SINCE MOVING TO MO IN 1965.

PLEASE PROTECT THE WATERS FROM CONTAMINATION FOR OUT CHILDREN.: SWIMMING,  
FISHING, BIRDING AND OTHER  
WILDLIFE EXPOSURES CAN'T BE REPLACED.

PLEASE LIMIT THE NUMBER OF HORSES ALLOWED TO CROSS THE RIVERS PER DAY. 4000  
PARTICIPANTS IN RALLY  
CAN CAUSE HAVOC IN THE WILD WATERWAYS. WESTERN AREAS HAVE BRIDGES FOR HORSE  
CROSSINGS

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2073 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 08:09:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I recommend that the NPS adopt Alternative A. This alternative does the most to protect this unique resource. I camp and canoe on rivers with a few friends, and we seek out the places and times where fewer people go. We enjoy a quiet experience with clear water, wildlife, and peace. I think the National Scenic Riverways areas should be preserved as untrammelled wilderness space to the highest degree possible. There are other locations where people can ride horses or take their motorized vehicles. Horses and motors and excessive trails are just too destructive for sensitive riparian environments like this. These heavy uses harm what these people are there to see.

Alternative B seems like a second best choice. But I think Alternative B would still have negative impacts on this beautiful, rare place because of horses and trails and heavier impacts than Alternative A.

Alternative C is unacceptable. It would lead to the deterioration of the environmental qualities that make the scenic river environment attractive, beautiful, and unique.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2074 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of...the Current River and Jacks Fork Riverâ€s free-flowing streamsâ€springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.



As an Illinois resident who has enjoyed many many hours floating on Missouri rivers, I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors such as myself for generations to come.

Sincerely,  
Cindy McMullan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2075    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 08:14:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am the President of the Ozark Trail Association. I support Alternative B to be carried forward under the General Management Plan. I support the restriction of horsepower limits on some parts of the river; I support the addition of hiking trail access and the removal of 10 miles of primitive road; and I support the consideration of mountain bike use on designated trails. I also support the reduction of access to gravel bars for vehicles. And I support more learning opportunities in the Riverways, for both natural and cultural resource interpretation.

I feel that it is important to showcase the Riverways by enhancing existing trails and developing new ones to give people an opportunity to explore and experience the Riverways up close. With an expanded trail network, it leaves open the opportunity for hike/float trips along these rivers; that is, one can park a car at a trailhead, hike upstream along a trail to a canoe outfitter and then float back to their car at the trailhead.

I feel it is very important for the Park Service to continue to foster relationships with volunteer organizations such as the Ozark Trail Association. These types of public-private partnerships are going to be necessary to keep these natural areas open accessible and enjoyable for all.

I do not support doing nothing at all. The Riverways is in need of attention and support and patrolling. Doing nothing at all would not be an appropriate course of action for the future of the Riverways. Alternative A seems too restrictive to me and Alternative C seems too heavy. The preferred alternative, B, seems to me to be the best fit.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2076    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 08:28:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I like Plan B. I trust the NPS to manage the rivers and streams in a way that protects them while granting access to all. We must remember that property rights should be protected, but is not the most important thing to be considered. The waters themselves must be maintained for future generations use. This is the most important. Controlling runoff and uses which harm the channels has to be managed to keep the waters safe,

clean and habitable for wildlife and people.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2077    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation ofâ€the Current River and Jacks Fork Riverâ€its free-flowing streamsâ€springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2078    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 08:41:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Plan A which is the most conservative. Through the years, this area has slowly disintegrated with overuse, in my opinion, especially because of motorized vehicles. I support as much conservation as possible to preserve native plant and animals. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2079    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 08:46:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** need to protect all our rivers, they are the lifeblood of our nation

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2080    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 08:51:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** SAMPLE COMMENTS

I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2081	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 08:53:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Our riverways are our best treasure here in MO. Yes, we have an arch, but without the riverways no one would have considered putting such a monument in the state. We need to pay attention and also staff the endeavor so that we can preserve what God has blessed. Marilyn				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2082	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 09:08:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.				

---

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2083	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 09:08:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

I have lived in the Eminence area my whole life and I have deep roots as my fathers family was some of the first settlers to the area. My fathers family moved to the area because of the beauty of the area as well as the many freedoms the area offered. They where farmers, carpenters, teachers, mechanics and business owners. They where community leaders who donated land for schools, churches and cemeteries. They where conservationist and took great pride in conservation practices on their farms. In 1971 their was legislation signed to protect my heritage, the natural beauty of the riverways as well as preserving those freedoms my ancestors choice such as hunting, fishing, camping, trapping, motor boating and etc. I chose to live in the area for those same reasons and was promised by the enabling legislation to protect the beauty of the area as well as my heritage. As a child I grew up on Mahan's Creek and Jacks Fork River, in the summer months I enjoyed swimming, horseback riding and caving on a daily basis. As a child our family had picnics at Alley frequently and we had family that would come for visits and camp at Alley Springs right by the spring branch for months at a time. We had a wooden john boat that my father had built and we would go on camping during the summer months. My family also enjoyed hunting trips. My husband and I enjoyed these same things as we raised our family and our children have raised their families enjoying the same activities. Now that my husband and I are older we no longer go camping, fishing or motor boat riding. We enjoy back roading in our four wheel drive truck. We often go on a daily basis on road trips to visit old home places, cemeteries, favorite camping spots, springs, caves, river roads, to see the wild horses, to see wildlife, the fall foliage, the winter snows and the many wonders of the area. I am also one of many photographers who enjoy taking photos of the area. Please keep all roads and trails open as the enabling legislation was intended to do.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2084    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 09:10:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been enjoying the recreational uses of the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers for over 30 years. I camp, fish, ride horses and canoe. This is very important to me not only for my personal enjoyment but I've been taking my children with me for over 25 years and now my grandchildren. Both my grandchildren have been coming since they were under 4 months old. We have all learned much about nature, the culture of the area it has also helped with family bonding. I have floated the river, camped, and ridden horses on trails with my children and grandchildren for years. They have learned much to respect nature and we have all grown as a family because of this. My late husband loved the area so much he came back for his last trip there and even died, as he wished, in the area. We all went to bluegrass festivals and many local craft shows. We have made close friends with local people, most of whom welcome outsiders with open arms

It would be a shame if this were to change. It is very important to keep these areas open for people and their families to enjoy as they always have. I know so many people that count the days from one year to the next until they can come back. I happen to live in a rural area but there are so many people that visit this area that have no access to nature and it's very important that they continue to be able to get away to an area they can rest, relax, and renew their spirit.

As for taking care of the natural resources I'm sure there is a very small portion of the population that doesn't respect the natural resources but do not think there are enough people abusing the area for it to unnecessarily restrict the recreational areas. On this note I think the ONSR would be better served by the state, which has a better record of keeping up their areas, than the federal government which does not have its finger on the pulse of the community. Why would you want to restrict so much enjoyment? It's there for all of us to enjoy not just for the chosen few and the chosen places. I think the GMP is overstepping boundaries by trying to regulate policy and visitor standards, as well as limiting future decisions by local government and people. By doing this you are adversely disturbing their livelihoods and indeed their future. Please turn the ONSR over to the state and leave it alone for the public's future use and pleasure.

Chris Tigrett Fox  
Highway 77  
Newbern, Tennessee 38059  
731 676-0651

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2085    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 09:13:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for caring about the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. However, you have some mistakes in your information. The first National River was and is the Buffalo River in Arkansas. Its pristine beauty

is now being threatened by the establishment of a corporate hog farm near a creek that flows into the river. This travesty is being fought here in Arkansas but seems to be unheard of in other places. It seems the EPA quietly approved the establishment of the hog farm without public notice for comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2086    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 09:19:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Several years ago I enjoyed canoeing on the Current River with my sister and her husband. I have read the three proposals for addressing problems in the Ozark Riverways.

I am in favor of proposal B which seems to me to allow public expanded use of the Riverways but without allowing high powered motor boats and which would also expand use of the land by horsemen and at the same time curtailing their use of non designated trails.

We would like to take another canoe trip on the Current River if proposal B is adopted

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2087    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 09:21:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Parks Servic:  
Thank you for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan and Wilderness Study. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo.  
However, I recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A:  
1) Closes illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads;  
2) Closes 65 miles of undesigned horse trails and adds no new stream crossings; and  
3) Bars vehicle access to gravel bars.

Also, I strongly request that you advocate for wilderness status designation for Big Spring.

My family and I have enjoyed many summers of recreational activity such as hiking, floats and camping along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and other areas of the Ozark Scenic Riverways-we cherish this natural resource and would like to see it preserved and strengthened for generations to come.

thank you for your time and consideration,  
Renee Duenow  
St. Louis, Missouri

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2088    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 09:24:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation ofâ€the Current River and Jacks Fork Riverâ€its free-flowing streamsâ€springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.
- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational

boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "â€preservation ofâ€the Current River and Jacks Fork Riverâ€its free-flowing streamsâ€springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

Sincerely,  
Brian T. Skubic

p.s. I am a young man who travels to this wonderful Riverway park as often as I can. I want it to be pristine and beautiful for not only for my kids, but for my grandkids and their children as well. I am for horseback riding on designated trails that allow it. I would not support ATVing inside the park because of the way ATV damage the land. The sound unnecessary boat motors is an unwelcoming sound that echos through the river valleys. When I go to a national park I want there to be a peaceful experience. I hope you will consider what I have just written and help this preserve this park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2089 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 09:38:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in support of the NO ACTION PLAN for several reasons. The first being the promise

made to us in the beginning that it we could use it as always. The second is the major negative economic impact closing some of the trails and roads would cause in this area. I also believe that there is safety issues in closing roads and trails. I attended 3 meetings and actually could not get any information from anyone on what roads and trails would be closed or where new trails would be. It all seemed so vague so how can anyone make a choice other than NO ACTION PLAN. People coming to our area spend alot of money just getting here and also while they are here. Closing horse trails will be very bad for the horse camps located in the area and to the towns located nearby. I ride several places each year and find the areas with designated trails are usally in bad repair, far worse than some in the riverway. I do not think that the park service has the funds or manpower to maintain the trails. The park service has not been able to keep trash picked up even on the river as several groups are doing it all year long. I think the horse people add a lot to the river way as several children get to pet or sit on a horse for the first time. Most people like seeing the horses and visit with us. I am 65 years old and ride anytime I can and have never seen or heard about a lot of conflicts. We live in a world that some people complain about everything do not let them ruin it for all of the rest of us, horseback riders, canoe people, motor boat people, and atv people that are respectful of this great area that is beatiful.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2090    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 09:51:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** First of all - as a life-long Missourian and as someone who has enjoyed all aspects of our natural resources - THANK YOU! Thank you for continued interests and involvement in the preservation and protection of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. It's my belief that these watersheds rank with the greatest of parks in your charge and are a true national treasure. It's my hope that your renewed efforts take every effort to protect, preserve and restore these fragile and irreplaceable environments - putting long-term viability over short-term gain or recreational convenience.

It's my understanding that the organizations that I support are supporter of your Plan B. With the following additions. Thank you for your time and efforts.

More hiking trails (each alternative offers 15 miles or fewer)

No horse campgrounds in the Riverways (25 sites are proposed for Alternatives B and C). We do not agree that the ONSR needs a designated horse camp in the park, preferring that this opportunity be developed by the private sector, on private land in proximity to the park. Instead of a new development of this magnitude, we ask that NPS work with existing local businesses to provide a concession horse camping operation outside the park that would have less impact on park resources within the narrow river corridor.

Minimal restrictions on motorized boats. We oppose year-round prohibitions on boats in certain stretches of the Riverways because such restrictions would eliminate opportunities for area residents to enjoy the Riverways. We think any restrictions on boats should be minimal and driven by evidence of a problem that only restrictions will solve. If better enforcement will solve the problem we prefer that to prohibitions.

Sensitive natural and cultural resource management that avoids new conversions of bottomland riparian forests to open fields, or artificial pasture for elk and other animals and focuses on restoration of upland meadows, woodlands, and glades with native vegetation.

The restoration of impaired riverbanks that avoids developed facilities along the rivers, which are screened from view from the river in any case, and low impact. We suggest that heavily engineered solutions be avoided (e.g. Rock and weirs) and instead NPS talent and experience be employed to bring natural landscape design and sustainable structures appropriate to the site.

Prioritization of solutions for problem areas that focuses on low-impacts in riparian zones. For example, the area across from Welch Spring should be restored where heavily rutted unauthorized roads mar an undeveloped bank. Damaged areas should not serve as opportunity to add new 'hardened' development where it does not belong and instead should receive restoration.

Additional Thoughts

MCE urges the National Park Service to approach the designation of mountain bike trails with care for the vulnerabilities of the landscape so that erosion, impacts to biodiversity and water quality are minimized.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2091    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 09:54:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I prefer Alternative B of the General Management Plan.

Thank you.

Ann Blanchfield  
208 4th St  
Farmington, MO 63640

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2092	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River its free-flowing streams its springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.
- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.
- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.
- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.
- Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you,  
Sandy Lynn

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2093	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 09:56:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I feel that if there are changes made to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways that our heritage here as locals will be damaged. I feel like we will no longer be able to visit old grave sites of our family that are				



along the banks of the current river because of the roads that will be closed. I won't be able to take my kids to the places where my grandparents grew up. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways has taken enough from my family in the past, I do not want them to take any more in the future. As locals, we love and cherish the rivers here and we want no more than for them to stay as they are and to be regulated the ways they are now. We have enough regulations. Please consider my thoughts.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2094    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 10:00:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2095    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 10:03:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We in Arkansas make a lot of tourist dollars, but mostly our environment and fish need clear waterways. Please help us out!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2096    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 10:04:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I remember fondly the first time my parents took me to the CROSS COUNTRY TRAIL RIDE. At the time it was located in Alley Springs, Mo. It was 1979 and I was 11 years old. It was a long time ago, but, every year, sometimes 2 or 3 times a year, I am that little girl again...riding with my dad in the woods in Emmenince..up the mountains and back down...through the river and down the roads...butterflies fluttering by...my dad pointing out the wild horses. He always asks me if I remember riding this trail or if I know where I am. I have been riding those trails with him for 30 years and when I am not there with him, I am the trail head for my friends and my own children and grandchildren, but I always respond back to my dad that I am lost. He is almost 78 years old and a cowboy finding out things that he can't do anymore...but he can ride his horse and be a man, be my strong daddy on them trails down there. It is the only place where we both step back in time. And after my dad is gone, I want to be out there riding with my children and their children and feeling my dad's presense with us. Those trails are a part of my life, who I am. I am that little girl with my dad.

..

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2097    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 10:07:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been on the upper Current River since the early 1960's and I don't believe there needs to be any change in management. If there has been any decline in the environment it has been minimal. In some ways I believe the park service has helped and in other ways it has been a detriment. Much the land which was open and free of brush is now choked up and not even good for wildlife except for cover.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2098 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 10:09:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to comment on the GMP and say that the water of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers is beautiful. I have visited the area several times in the last several years and have always loved the kindness of the local boaters and campers. They take such care of their rivers. I have floated the Jacks Fork and Current, as well as boated the Current. I have yet to see the trash in which I have heard the environmentalists speak of. And when I have seen trash, it was being picked up by a local boater. The water is beautiful and no tests have proved any pollution. The water is as crystal clear as it was 100 years ago and it is well managed. Until this is not the case, I will disagree with the any new regulations to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2099 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 10:10:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a resident of southeast Missouri; I live about 45 minutes away from the Big Spring area, and my family frequently visits the park to canoe, hike, picnic, etc. Before I dive into my arguments for my position, let me state my premise: I support management alternative B.

As you know, the National Park Service has two primary duties: to preserve natural and historic resources, and to allow for the responsible use and enjoyment of these resources. The National Park Service Organic Act of 1916 orders the NPS "to promote and regulate the use of the...national parks...which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." Alternative B will effectively balance ecological/preservation concerns with the need to allow citizens to visit and enjoy their national park. I am convinced that the current operations of ONSR are not sustainable. Alternative A would create an ecologically sustainable management system, but it would greatly reduce the ability of visitors to explore and enjoy their park. This would cause devastating harm to the local communities and economies that depend on the park. Alternative C would allow easy access but would cause further harm to the ecosystems, historical preservation, and natural resources of the park. If the National Park Services takes no action to protect our natural resources, these resources will not be available for the enjoyment of future generations. Our enjoyment of our national park lands has a serious impact on the ecosystems, waterways, and landscapes that make up these lands. If we want to preserve lands for the enjoyment of our children and grandchildren, then we need to make sure that we manage them in a wise, sustainable way.

I am very troubled by the political responses to the draft management plan. For several weeks, many local leaders and legislators have been talking about how the park belongs to the people of the communities that surround it, and so they should be the ones to decide how it is managed. This position is simply wrong. As a national park and a national resource, ONSR belongs to the people of the entire United States, not just to the people of southern Missouri. The NPS must consider how changes in management will affect the local communities that surround the park, but it must also represent and act in the best interests of the entire nation. It is in the national interest to have parks that are clean, sustainable, and beautiful. They are part of our national heritage.

Recently, both Missouri Lieutenant Governor Peter Kinder and state Senator Doug Libla have written op/ed pieces calling for ONSR to be transferred from federal to state control. If such a move were to occur, I assume that the Missouri Department of Natural Resources would take control of the property as a state park. I am strongly opposed to the idea of transferring control of the Riverways from the National Park Service to the Missouri state park system. Missouri does, of course, have one of the premier state park systems in the nation. I have visited state parks all over the country, and I have found none that are better preserved, more wisely managed, or more accessible than Missouri's however. However, one statement in one of the op/ed pieces forms the starting point for my argument against the transfer proposal. In a February 4 opinion article in Poplar Bluff's Daily American Republic newspaper,

Senator Doug Libla wrote, "Thousands of out-of-state as well as in-state hikers, campers, boaters, hunters, fishermen and horseback riders visit this area annually and bring many irreplaceable dollars when they come." The thousands of out-of-state visitors point to the main reason why the Riverways should remain a national park and not a state park. National parks belong to the entire country and not simply to citizens of one state, region, or municipality. The national park system is a source of pride for all Americans. As proud as I am of our Missouri state parks, national park status confers a national prestige that state park status does not. Senator Libla went on to say that "we need to be promoting this beautiful and wonderful resource, not restricting access to it!" Please understand that allowing the Riverways to remain in federal control is the best way to promote the park. State parks - with the possible exceptions of Niagara Falls State Park in New York and Custer State Park in South Dakota - do not have the same draw as national parks. National parks belong to all Americans, so all Americans have the opportunity and privilege of visiting them, promoting them, and preserving them.

I appreciate that the NPS is seeking and listening to citizen input in this process. I thank you for your time and consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2100	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 10:19:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have floated, hiked, and camped this area hundreds of times and I firmly believe that "Alternative A" is the only logical path.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2101	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 10:26:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I believe the GMP plan is right direction for Ozark National Scenic Riverways, and I support the National Park Service.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2102	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Black:				

---

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.
- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.
- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.
- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.
- Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you  
MHB

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2103    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 10:42:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I enjoy visiting the rivers in Missouri and appreciate when they are clear and clean. The wildlife that use the rivers are also a joy to see. I favor plan A.  
Thanks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2104    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 10:46:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2105    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 10:58:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent -

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as

proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2106 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 11:02:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am 100% iavor of the NPS preferred plan and would actually rather see a more restrictive one. I am a 5th generation Carter County girl, whose family was one of the first to settle this area. We must protect this incredible place! The so called voice of the locals are not correct in saying we have protected this for generations on our own, and do not need the NPS. This is not true. Our earliest ancestors simply lived and farmed this area. They did not have 4x4 vehicles, jet boats, horses for entertainment, there were a handful of them, not millions. They were indeed gentle on the resources. Without the NPS to continue to protect, there will be nothing here to protect. At some point we all must realize how blessed we are to live in such a place and to realize it is a National Park that belongs to everyone!

Again, 100% iavor of the most restrictive plan the NPS has.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2107 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 11:25:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Heard about this via text message from a friend that I have canoed theses rivers and many other Ozark rivers with. I am in favor of The most restrictive Alternative A, knowing that the result will probably be closer to Alternative B. One sensitive issue I know would be contentious would be the local trails piece of A. I'm sure there are many locals that know and use these and that it is a bit of a local tradition, although illegal. It reminds me a little of the loss of traditional hunting permission happening in Kansas due to outsiders coming in and buying the land or offering rental money to landowners for exclusive rights. Of course the landowners can turn it down, but it is a case of negative outside influence impacting a traditional land use practice.

I am all for a more peaceful experience on the river with an emphasis on being in tune with the river and understanding the ecosystem. Too many individuals want to float the river and know nothing about it. They just want another 'party cove.' I was appalled to be on the North Fork of the White with co-workers from Great Britain and Spain as well as a Kansas City co-worker and his family with three small girls. I was appalled at the behavior of some floaters as well as the sheer numbers.

I am a 52 yr old male who grew up in St. Louis floating Ozark streams. I have taken my kids to the rivers as much as possible from my home in Kansas City and recently since I have moved across the state line to Kansas. Ozark

waterways are a true national gem and restricting the use is no problem for me. If I fail to plan ahead I may not find an outfitter when I want. The upside is the area stays in better shape for those who are able to spend time there.

I am appreciative for the opportunity to comment. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2108    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 11:29:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Jack's Fork and Current Rivers need our protection to preserve them for our children and grandchildren. I support Alternative A and also support wilderness designation for the Big Spring area.

Sincerely,  
Beverly J. Bross

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2109    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 11:38:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I find Alternative A preferable to the others. It's important to preserve the natural character of the rivers in as unspoiled a state as possible lest we love the ONSR to death. I have floated the Current and Jacks Fork going back to 1973, and have seen the degradation caused by overuse and inappropriate activities.

Alternative A would eliminate vehicular access to gravel bars. This is extremely important in preventing disturbance of the water and sediment. Horses pollute the water with dangerous bacteria like E. coli, and A would do more than the other plans to restrict horse traffic in the streams, while still offering equestrian access to the park. Alternative A would close more miles of roads and add more hiking trails. Hiking is the kind of low-impact recreation that best fits these areas. Alternative A would also allow the least access to motorboats. While I understand that local people value this kind of recreation, I believe motorboats belong on lakes and big rivers, not on these Ozark streams.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2110    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 11:56:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am for the no action plan. It is hard to make a living in this area and tourism brings in much needed revenue. I think that it is great to see the trail riders come to our area and I like most people think that any of the other plans could actually run people off. I do not see any value to a permit system for trail riders. The whole report is very confusing and hard to read. The riverways is a great place to vacation or visit do not change a thing.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2111    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 12:03:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.
- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.
- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated

trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

Sincerely,  
travis allen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2112    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 12:08:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2113    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 12:14:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hoping you will select alternative plan B.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2114    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 12:22:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I think that alternative A with some additions of the information centers and other programs. I do not understand why horse people have to have a permit. This I feel is discrimination. I float and ride. It seems that B has the widest range of users in mind and still taking care of the land. Would like to know WHY horse users need a permit? Feel free to email me with info. Does A infringe on landowners rights?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2115    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 12:35:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly favor the "No Action Alternative" to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan.

Economic Impact: A very important point to consider by NPS in the planning process is the significant negative impact that Alternatives A, B and C will have on the local 6 county area. With tourism being the largest economic contributor in this area (especially Carter and Shannon counties), businesses will suffer and many jobs lost. This geographic area where ONSR is located is considered the most depressed economic area of Missouri, more jobs need to be created, not lost. Park Management needs to, through better relations and cooperation with congressional delegations, obtain an increase in base funding to better maintain Park assets and provide better quality visitor services.

Cultural and natural landscapes: As per the 1964 enabling legislation, Park Management is mandated to preserve, protect and manage the natural and cultural resources to the existing mid-1960's appearance and conditions. The Park should make it a priority to better maintain the historical structures, old farmsteads, scenic viewpoints and overall viewsheds. In the 1980's, the Park (for a few years) had an "Open Fields Management Plan" where fields were brushhogged, disced and native grasses sown. With prescribed burning and mechanical means, the traditionally open fields could be returned to the condition and appearance mandated in the legislation.

Roads: All Park roads, traces and accesses, whether Park-owned, county-owned or public roads, should remain open and unimpeded for all park visitor usage. This should include both motorized and non-motorized use. All secondary (non-paved gravel) roads should be maintained on a regular basis with a minimum once-per-year grading of cemetery roads, traditionally prior to Memorial Day each year. With adequate (two-wheel drive) road access, families and cemetery associations will continue to maintain the graves and cemetery grounds. When access roads are not maintained to minimum (regular grading and brush removal) standards, deteriorated conditions severely affects elderly and physically limited visitors from driving to fishing/swimming holes, hunting areas, former family farms and/or other recreation uses.

Trails: Current hiking and horse trails should remain in present locations with more emphasis by NPS and trail users on maintaining trail surfaces and erosion control. The Park should foster better relations with trail users (cooperative maintenance) and involve all users in any future planning processes. All current and traditional river crossings should remain as presently being used.

Outboard Motors: Current regulations and motor size restrictions are presently more stringent than necessary. River depth and natural obstructions have always been the self-limiting factors as to motorized watercraft. Recommend no change to present.

Cultural Interpretive Demonstrations: In addition to current cultural demonstrations, the Park should strive to re-implement the previous demonstrations of whiskey making, blacksmithing and sorghum making. These traditional native activities were extremely popular with the visiting public and very educational for area school groups.

Water Quality: Park management should be more pro-active in preventing the loss of stream banks, especially in developed areas of the Park. Large amounts of taxpayer monies have been invested in facilities within the river floodplain. One example (there are many) is the loss of stream bank and campsites at the Alley Springs campground, due to neglect and lack of stream bank stabilization. No doubt, one medium (4 to 8 foot rise) flood event per year (usually several) causes more erosion and river sedimentation than all public uses combined, each year.

I strongly favor the "No Action Alternative" to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2116	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 12:39:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly favor the "No Action Alternative" to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan.				

Economic Impact: A very important point to consider by NPS in the planning process is the significant negative impact that Alternatives A, B and C will have on the local 6 county area. With tourism being the largest economic contributor in this area (especially Carter and Shannon counties), businesses will suffer and many jobs lost. This geographic area where ONSR is located is considered the most depressed economic area of Missouri, more jobs need to be created, not lost. Park Management needs to, through better relations and cooperation with congressional delegations, obtain an increase in base funding to better maintain Park assets and provide better quality visitor services.

Outboard Motors: Current regulations and motor size restrictions are presently more stringent than necessary. River depth and natural obstructions have always been the self-limiting factors as to motorized watercraft. Recommend no change to present.



Water Quality: Park management should be more pro-active in preventing the loss of stream banks, especially in developed areas of the Park. Large amounts of taxpayer monies have been invested in facilities within the river floodplain. One example (there are many) is the loss of stream bank and campsites at the Alley Springs campground, due to neglect and lack of stream bank stabilization. No doubt, one medium (4 to 8 foot rise) flood event per year (usually several) causes more erosion and river sedimentation than all public uses combined, each year.

Cultural and natural landscapes: As per the 1964 enabling legislation, Park Management is mandated to preserve, protect and manage the natural and cultural resources to the existing mid-1960's appearance and conditions. The Park should make it a priority to better maintain the historical structures, old farmsteads, scenic viewpoints and overall viewsheds. In the 1980's, the Park (for a few years) had an "Open Fields Management Plan" where fields were brushhogged, disced and native grasses sown. With prescribed burning and mechanical means, the traditionally open fields could be returned to the condition and appearance mandated in the legislation.

Roads: All Park roads, traces and accesses, whether Park-owned, county-owned or public roads, should remain open and unimpeded for all park visitor usage. This should include both motorized and non-motorized use. All secondary (non-paved gravel) roads should be maintained on a regular basis with a minimum once-per-year grading of cemetery roads, traditionally prior to Memorial Day each year. With adequate (two-wheel drive) road access, families and cemetery associations will continue to maintain the graves and cemetery grounds. When access roads are not maintained to minimum (regular grading and brush removal) standards, deteriorated conditions severely affects elderly and physically limited visitors from driving to fishing/swimming holes, hunting areas, former family farms and/or other recreation uses.

Trails: Current hiking and horse trails should remain in present locations with more emphasis by NPS and trail users on maintaining trail surfaces and erosion control. The Park should foster better relations with trail users (cooperative maintenance) and involve all users in any future planning processes. All current and traditional river crossings should remain as presently being used.

Cultural Interpretive Demonstrations: In addition to current cultural demonstrations, the Park should strive to re-implement the previous demonstrations of whiskey making, blacksmithing and sorghum making. These traditional native activities were extremely popular with the visiting public and very educational for area school groups.

I strongly favor the "No Action Alternative" to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2117	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 13:06:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have several wonderful memories of float trips down the Current River and plenty of miraculous observances on Jack's Fork. We are so fortunate to have these national treasures so close to us. I am concerned for the continued health of these watersheds when too much alcohol is consumed by its visitors. Surely, we can do better than that when we visit responsibly. When we're sober enough to clean up after ourselves. When we consider the fragility of the stream banks. We've had a long history depending upon our own conscience to be responsible for common stewardship. It's not proving enough, is it?				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2118	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 13:16:21				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have 55 years experience canoeing the Current, Jack's Fork and I hope the NPS picks the most stringent environmental regulations as the major part of the new management plan.				

Thank you,  
Bill  
Fordyce

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2119	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 13:19:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We are a lucky human race to have such a hospitable place as the Earth as our planet. Let's				

treat it like we would if we were to be invited into someone's home. We might take our boots and shoes off and leave them in the foyer so as not to muddy the carpet. We would appreciate our host's décor, the wall paper, the color scheme, the flooring, the lighting, the paintings and sculpture, and the inviting furniture. We wouldn't think of setting our glass down on the mahogany end table and leaving an indelible ring. Or we wouldn't throw our crumbs or wrappers on the floor but ask where can we put the refuse. We wouldn't use the restroom and leave without flushing the toilet or tidying up so that we left it as we found it. And most of all, we would enjoy the hospitality of our hosts and respect their home.

Make those ATVers and horse riders wipe their feet before crossing one of our Ozark streams. If we adopt alternative A to the Draft Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways the Earth might welcome us back.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2120    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 13:38:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern,

Please listen to the voice crying in the wilderness, which Webster defines as - 1 an uncultivated, uninhabited region; wild 2 any barren, empty or open area, as of ocean 3 a large, confused mass or tangle of persons or things 4 a wild condition or quality.

This wilderness has almost all of the above, with the exceptions being 'uninhabited' and 'ocean.' The Ozarks, having been settled for some time now, still has it's share of uncultivation, emptiness, confusion, tangles and yes - people. Many of which are admittedly confused and wild, but most of which are quite civilized. This wilderness even has Masses, now that the Catholics have 'mission' churches in Eminence and Van Buren.

There is also another voice or voices, coming mostly from non-wilderness areas, crying for more wilderness. They want to make some or all of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways a "wilderness" area. When the federal government acquired this gem of Ozark beauty, it was with a promise and a challenge - "...to preserve the free-flowing Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, the surrounding natural resources, and the unique cultural heritage of the Ozark people." To turn it into "wilderness" areas would not only be breaking that promise, it would entail further elimination of, not preservation of, the unique cultural heritage of the Ozark people.

Ozark people have a long heritage of using, enjoying and having access to the rivers. Boating, horseback riding, swimming, camping, fishing, gigging and hunting are all a part of that long heritage and culture. A wilderness is what was here before those historic and cultural uses of the rivers began to evolve. The promise and challenge was to make it a park, for enjoyment and recreation, while preserving it's unique natural beauty. Has that not been done? Webster's New World Dictionary has eight definitions of the word 'park' and that may be why so many are confused about what the Riverways is or should be. However, if one substitutes the words "Park Service" for "King" - here's how the first definition would read - "an enclosed area of land, held by authority of the (Park Service) or by prescription, stocked and preserved for hunting." While no one is suggesting enclosing the park or that a park ranger be addressed as "Your Majesty," going back to the basics of that old English definition just might be a good rule of thumb to consider.

In Shannon and Carter Counties, the two counties most impacted by the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, there are already thousands of acres given to wilderness, or near wilderness, areas. Besides the timbered acres of the Riverways, there is the Mark Twain National Forest, the Missouri Department of Conservation's forests and Peck Ranch game preserve, the Nature Conservancy lands, Pioneer Forest and the Roger Prior Backwoods preserve, the Ozark Trail, Missouri Department of Natural Resources' State Parks and much private land that remains undeveloped. With what must be the highest percentage of wilderness in all of Missouri, many are asking when is enough, enough?

The voice in this wilderness is crying because of proposals that would deny people access. Access that many local families and tourists alike have enjoyed for generations. Access to the 'resource' as it is referred to in Park Service manuals. Access that due to the unique topography of these ancient hills, has always been difficult, but has never been denied. At least not at the levels now being proposed.

Please consider too, the wildfires that have recently destroyed vast tracts of this nation's wooded preserves on unprecedented levels. These wildfires raise a red flag that shouts "access to the resource," especially one that involves widespread woodlands, is not only necessary, it is imperative. Firefighters need roads to control wildfires. Plus the elderly and physically challenged need roads and motorized vehicles to have access to areas that a "wilderness" designation will deny.

The voice in the wilderness is crying that old Ozark adage, "If something ain't broke - don't fix it." It may not be

good English, but it is good sense. Whoever included the "Do Nothing" option in the draft ONSR General Management Plan, must have done so for a reason, if not many. That option is the one that makes the most sense. There is already an encyclopedia full of rules and regulations by which the Scenic Riverways is to be governed. If those are enforced properly, with dash of common sense, which is surely enough of a challenge for the Park Service already, will that not ensure that the Rivers and the unique culture of the Ozark people are kept at a level upon which almost all reasonable voices can agree? The voice in the wilderness is crying out words of wisdom: Let it be. All things considered - No Action is the best option.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2121 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 13:42:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I fully support Alternative B as proposed within th MP. I fully support additional proper and adequate funding to insure the NPS has the resources necessary to manage and or mitigate the problems that are occurring due to over use, illegal roads, excessive and damaging equestrian use, illegal ATV and 4WD activities, illegal and unofficial river accesses and associated illegal roads, horsepower restrictions, boat access, erosion, disorderly and non-family based activities.

I fully support the Big Spring Wilderness inclusion.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2122 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 13:43:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I favor alternate A except that all 3 alternates say that "Camping would be allowed only on designated gravel bars and away from the river". If the intent is to prohibit all camping on gravel bars I am very much against this. I was told at the Kirkwood public meeting that this was meant to apply to camping from motorized terrestrial vehicles, which sounds fine. If that is the intent, I would advise rewording this. I have been camping on gravel bars from canoeing nearly my whole life (I am 60) and would be terribly upset if this is outlawed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2123 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 13:44:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep this park as a National, NOT State, entity. It's important for the health and welfare of the park and for any hopes of continuing the preservation of this jewel for future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2124 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 13:58:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect the national treasure of the ONSR. If you don't step in now, it could be too late when you try to correct the damage. Personally I'm in favor of Plan A, but would be happy with Plan B.

BUT MOVE FAST AND SAVE OUR PARK!

Thank you.  
Diane O'Leary

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2125 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 14:06:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** What a treasure we have close by in the great state of Missouri! I believe the Ozark National Scenic Riverways comprises one of the most beautiful areas in America. For the past 35 years I've been blessed with the privilege of spending many days on the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers. Whether it has been floating, camping, and trout fishing with family and friends from the beginning of the National Park above Tan Vat's to Cedargrove....or floating the Jack's Fork in winter with my brother when canyon bluffs are covered with ice flows and iciclesâ€or the almost annual extended "family campout" and float trip where part of what happens is introducing and sharing with the next generation the beauty of our Riverwaysâ€or going with "the guys" who I've fished with most of my adult life to either one of these rivers for a smallmouth fishing/floating/camping

tripâ€almost all of my time spent in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways remain some of the best times I've had.

The National Park Service is to be commended for coming forth (finally) with this new Draft General Management Plan and giving us a chance again to have some input and voice our opinion about the future management of the Riverways. I also commend the Park Service for hearing the concerns expressed in the past about the rude, rowdy, drunken, disorderly behavior by some users of the Riverways and taking action to address these concerns. I confess that I do not know what all you did to cause a decrease in this behavior, but please keep doing it! I have personally noticed the difference in recent years and only wish you could do even more. But I guess considering the present state of humanity, there will always be some rude and crude drunks wherever you go.

But the real work for the Park Service and all who love these Rivers remains ahead. So many people now visit that constant work and diligence and scientific study needs to be done in order to avoid devastating harm being done to our Park. I just don't see how we can afford NOT to do more to reduce the amount of vehicular access to gravel bars and unauthorized roads, or reduce the proliferation of horse trails that cross the river and run through other fragile areas of the watershed. Surely the Park Service and horsemen and women can work together to come up with plans for trails that meet both the recreational pleasures and the ecological scrutiny necessary to preserve the quality of this national treasure.

Your work is cut out for you (or is it "Our work is cut out for us"). Since the release of this plan, I have taken the opportunity to read the entire document and re-read parts repeatedly, attend the public meeting in Salem, visit the park, and read about everything I could find by searching the internet for information (and mis-information). And while Plan Alternatives A, B, and C each have many positive points, if I have to choose one I would go with Alternative B. Because of what I personally like, and how I have personally experienced the Riverways, my first preference would actually be "A". However, it is critical that a plan be implemented that also addresses the desires of a broader group of people and their preferences, and I think "B" does this best.

Unfortunately, from what I observed and heard at the Salem meeting, have read, and discussed, I think it will be difficult for the Park Service to really move forward. Being a government agency, you are a victim of the mistrust that so many have of any government agency, especially a federal agency. And it appears obvious that our Representative, Jason Smith, will fight and obstruct any effort you make to move forward. And while I compliment you on some of the positive steps you have taken (for example, taking steps to control rowdy behavior and putting forth this draft management plan), I would also be critical of you for being negligent in allowing some of the activities that negatively impact this National Park to occur. Examples include the proliferation of unauthorized horse trails and roads that reach the rivers, as well as scenic easement violations. The Park Services negligence in the past will only make it more difficult to curtail these activities in the future. (It is hard to put the Genie back in the bottle once you've let it out). Is there another National Park that would ever allow this sort of activity to go on? I have visited many, and I have never seen it.

What is called for now, I believe, is true leadership on the part of the National Park Service. In my opinion, your draft management plan demonstrates that the Park Service is well aware of challenges facing the park and the need to take constructive steps to protect this national treasure. And even in this climate of mistrust of the federal government and doubt about any proposal that any agency puts forth, I'm optimistic that you can do more to move forward with the vision that was put forth in some of the founding principles that were written when the Park was first established.

Again, congratulations on finally coming forth with proposals that seek to address many of the issues currently facing the Riverways and with a vision for the future. I certainly haven't begun to go down the list of items in my preferred "Plan B" and make comments on each one (like proposed wildernessâ€I'm for it), but I've rambled enough! Please move forward with bold steps and leadership to insure that this wonderful resource will also be available for my grandchildren and their grandchildren to enjoy.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2126	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 14:18:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I support the No-action Alternative and continuation of the current management plan. The current plan has the flexibility to address all issues associated with the management of the riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2127    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of...the Current River and Jacks Fork Riverâ€s free-flowing streamsâ€springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

- Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2128    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 14:46:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Alternative A offers the most protection for the Ozark Riverways, which should be protected. This alternative is preferred but you prefer Alternative B, so here are some of the things I want to point out.

- Alternative B lacks primitive zones. In particular in the Upper Jacks Fork River from the western boundary to Bay Creek is a special area and needs the zoning designation of primitive and not natural.

- The large amount of rare and endangered plants and plants of concern that have been found in the upper section of the Jacks Fork River need protection.

- The area in the Upper Jacks Fork between the western boundary and Bay Creek is important because of the water flow in the area and should be closed to motor boating.

- There needs to be a Horse Trail Study/Working Group for the Current River as well. There are a lot of horse trails in the Current River that are not designated trails and they need to be either designated or closed.

Horse trails need to be moved out of the flood plain and other sensitive areas.

- Horse Camps in the Upper Jacks Fork are NOT healthy for the river. Large groups of campers and horses destroy vegetation, create hoards of flies, and cause manure to flow into the river when it rains. There should NOT be a 25 horse campground in the area because of the sensitive plant life and highly developed Karst. Hay brought in to feed horses has introduced invasive plant species. There should be a controlled use/permitting system for the use of

horses in the park.

- What is an "access point." Why 20?
- It would be good to free the flow of the river as long as a correctly built bridge would replace any low-water bridge that is removed.
- ATV's should never be allowed on the gravel bars or trails, ATV riders should have to comply with the state law for helmets, permits, and flagging.
- Non motorized mountain biking is a good idea and would expand the recreational use with a low impact on the Riverways - as long as the trails were properly maintained and patrolled by the rangers.
- The roads and trails study was done in 1990- 24 years ago. How many roads have not been closed that the 1990 study say's should be?
- More hiking trails are needed.
- There is a lack of funding to patrol the trails and the ATV users are continuing to use the old and new trails; this issue needs to be addressed before there is any expansion of the trail systems in the Park.
- Motor vehicles do not belong on gravel bars, except in cases of access for the disabled. And then a motor vehicle should be used only to drop off the person and then leave to a designated area. Motor vehicles leak oil on the gravel bar and it works its way into the river.
- It would be great to have a facility that could properly store some of the Museum collections of the Park Service, and be able to display parts of the Museum collection so that the history of the area can be shared with visitors.
- The cultural history of the area should not be lost.
- The Powder Mill camp ground is in the flood plain. This would limit the amount of development that can/should be done. It is highly questionable if the flood plain should be developed at all.
- The Park Service needs to provide better training & feedback for those that volunteer for the Park. Perhaps a designated/dedicated staff/contact position could be made?
- Park boundary issues between the Park Service and DNR need to be worked on and networking expanded. There are developments with poorly planned roads and even some illegal dumps next to the river.
- It would be important to establishing a partnership between the Park Service and the Stream Team Program to provide educational schools/camps for Missouri children, perhaps at the old Welsh Lodge. A facility along the pristine Current River would be of great benefit to people who have never seen a healthy river.
- The Hellbenders and bats within the Park must be protected! Some caves have not been gated but should be. The Hellbender is dying off. Its habitat needs to be identified and a definite designation of protection for such habitat. Hellbenders have been found in the Upper Jacks Fork. Horse camps and more development would put them at increased risk. Bats are major pollinators and eat millions of pounds of insects and are being decimated by the white nose fungus. The ONSR needs to fully protect its bats. These rare and beautiful creatures are why some people come to Park. And they are an essential part of the larger ecosystem.
- Finally, I must comment on the political situation in which people have shown up at the various Park Plan Comment meetings to say they demand that the Park revert to state control. In this politically polarized era and environment, many people operate outside the realm of facts, and fail to recognize the bounty, beauty and preciousness of this area, and the duty to protect it for all generations to come. Many just hate government, especially federal government.

Such a move would be a disaster for this vital resource! The Missouri legislature has historically denied adequate funding to Missouri State Parks. The state legislature would most likely have difficulty even finding and appropriating money for the purchase of such a large parcel of land, and certainly would be unable or unwilling to supply adequate operational funding, making it seem logical or at least tempting that parts or perhaps the entire ONSR be put up for sale to private owners. Such a scenario would leave the rivers, springs and adjacent lands open for abuse from ORV/ATVs, pollution, erosion, overuse and industries such as mining, which could easily destroy the entire river and ecosystem. A half century of federal management has preserved these magnificent rivers and springs for ALL Americans to enjoy. The ONSR brings in millions of dollars of revenue and employment to local counties. Decommissioning this National Park would be a physical and fiscal disaster. It would in no way serve the common good of Missourians or US citizens. Alternative A offers the most protection for the Ozark Riverways. Again, I prefer that aAlternative A. Please give my comments your deepest consideration - preserve this once-only natural resource.

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please take care to consider the long term future of the National Park and protect the rivers and surrounding areas. From my reading of the situation, I feel Alternative B makes the most sense. I have spent hundreds of hours on the Jacks Fork River, and quite a few hours on the Current River-mostly the upper Current. Things have deteriorated on both rivers in the 50 or so years I have been going there, even with the establishment of the National Park. Let's do better!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2130 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 15:00:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the No-action Alternative and continuation of the current management plan. The current plan has the flexibility to address all issues asociated with the management of the riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2131 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 15:02:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to strongly support most of the items mentioned in Alternative B and to pursue wilderness designation for the entire Big Springs tract. I have been visiting the Current/Jacks Fork area multiple times per year going back to 1975. I agree with the goal of increasing the educational efforts mentioned in Alternative B.

I believe that requiring the horse riders to get a permit, even if free, will be almost impossible to administer as most rides start on private property. This would only serve to anger the horse people further against the park. When you refer to backcountry campsites where a fee would be charged, I assume you mean ones that you can drive to with a car and not gravel bar camping along the river. If you are going to charge a fee then I would hope you provide a place to park cars, trash pickup, fire rings, and maybe a primitive toilet in high use areas.

The Current/Jacks Fork Rivers already have some of the nicest, well spaced access points with floater parking of any river in Missouri. I don't see the crowding issue except maybe above Van Buren which is outside the park for the most part. If you must, you could have the outfitters only put on so many boats per hour at the busy points on weekends on the upper river. I have a big problem with tearing down a perfectly good access and then destroying the trees and viewshed just downstream to put in a new one. I would hope you would not reduce the number of established official putin points. (I agree that Cedargrove access needs to be improved and also the road into Roberts Field should have a culvert or bridge over the creek.)

Putting in a developed campground at Akers (where there was one before) would be nice. If you want to put in a "developed campground" on the upper Jacks Fork, I would not put it in the Blue Springs area as the terrain is very steep when you get near the river and the area is subject to flooding. (There is a small primitive camping area there now.) A better place with more level ground near the river would be Buck Hollow or Rymers.

I hope that all the input and feedback that you got in 2009 is fully considered and not thrown away. I also wonder why it took 4 1/2 years to get from there to where we are now during which the park was managed under the "no action alternative".

Finally, I hope that the voice of one local state politician does not overshadow the views of the many visitors to your park who contribute to the local economy while we are there.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2132 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 15:03:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I do not want any restrictions on the boat motors. The river belongs to the people. The gravel bars belong to the people. God put them there for us to use. I do not want the motor boats taken off the upper Current River/Jacks Fork. I do not want restrictions on motor size at Van Buren. The river has so much heritage that we are passing on to our children and grandchildren. Their great-grandparents lived and farmed along the river. They ran a commissary boat on the river, delivering goods to the people in the small communities along the river, way before the Park Service started taking it over. The towns close to the river - Ellington, Eminence, Van Buren,

Winona - just to name a few, the gas sold to people from the gas stations for there boats, the grocery stores that sell the soda & picnic items, and don't forget about the taxes that are paid for boat license and sales tax. Just leave the river alone and let the people take care of it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2133    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 15:04:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I like the river the way it is. I like the gravel bars where we have picnics and play in the sand. Leave them alone

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2134    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 15:05:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the No-action Alternative and continuation of the current management plan. The current plan has the flexibility to address all issues associated with the management of the riverways. Thank You.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2135    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 15:07:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I submit the following comments on the draft General Management Plan ("GMP") for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways ("ONSR") on behalf of the Center for Biological Diversity (the "Center"). The Center is a national, nonprofit conservation organization with more than 625,000 members and online activists dedicated to the protection of endangered species and wild places. The Center and its members are concerned with the conservation of imperiled species, including the endangered Ozark hellbender.

For the reasons explained below, the Center recommends that the National Park Service ("NPS") adopt the environmentally preferred alternative, Alternative A, to guide management of the ONSR. Alternative A is most protective of the ONSR's water quality, which is critical to the survival and recovery of the Ozark hellbender.

#### ONSR's Prime Recreational Waters

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways was established in 1964 as the nation's first federally-protected national river. The park extends along 134 miles (approximately 80,000 acres) of the free-flowing Current River and one of its tributaries, the Jacks Fork, in the Ozark Highlands of southeastern Missouri.

The Current River and Jacks Fork are prime recreational waters attracting approximately 1.5 million visitors each year. A 2011 study estimated visitor spending at more than 55 million dollars with nearly 90 percent of spending from non-local visitors. Because of this spending and employment by the NPS, the ONSR has generated 845 jobs, which is approximately 15 percent of the total employment in Shannon and Carter counties. Accordingly, maintaining water quality is important for the local economy that depends on these waterways for recreational uses, such as boating, fishing, and floating.

As a unit of the National Park System, management of the ONSR must ensure protection of the Park's resources in an unimpaired condition for public recreation, education, and scientific value.

#### Status of Ozark Hellbenders in the ONSR

Ozark Hellbenders are endemic to the White River drainage in northern Arkansas and southern Missouri. Hellbenders are habitat specialists that depend on consistent levels of dissolved oxygen, temperature, and flow. See U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Endangered Status for the Ozark Hellbender Salamander, 76 Fed. Reg. 61956, 61,957 (Oct. 6, 2011).

Evidence indicates Ozark Hellbenders are declining throughout their range, and no populations appear to be stable (76 Fed. Reg. at 61,958). Likely less than 600 Ozark hellbenders remain, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service listed the Ozark hellbender as endangered in October of 2011. 76 Fed. Reg. 61956 (Oct. 6, 2011).



Historically, Ozark hellbenders could be found in portions of the Spring, White, Black, Eleven Point, and Current Rivers and their tributaries (North Fork White River, Bryant Creek, and Jacks Fork) (76 Fed. Reg. at 61,958). Currently, Ozark Hellbender populations are known to occur in Bryant Creek, North Fork of the White River, Eleven Point River, and Current River, with some individuals possibly still present in the White River, Spring River, and Jacks Fork (USFWS 2012).

In the Current River, which flows through the ONSR, it has been estimated that 80 hellbenders remain (76 Fed. Reg. at 61,960). Scientists documented Ozark hellbenders in Jacks Fork, a tributary of the Current River that flows through the ONSR, in 1992. But no hellbenders were found during investigations of Jacks Fork in 2003 nor were any found in 2006 during 7 person-hours of searching (76 Fed. Reg. at 61,960).

#### Planning Documents for Park Management

Every park in the national park system is required by law to have a current general management plan. The ONSR's last plan was done more than 25 years ago, in 1984. The 1984 General Management Plan authorizes numerous activities on the ONSR (NPS 1984). The plan called for a more detailed study of river access sites and of other roads, traces, and horse trails in the riparian corridor (Flader 2011). These studies resulted in a river management plan issued in 1989 (NPS 1989) and a roads and trails study issued in 1991 (NPS 1991). Along with the annually issued Supervisor's Compendium, these documents authorize ongoing activities on the ONSR, for example, by setting maximum use limits for canoe use, setting horsepower limits for motorboats in some areas, identifying areas on the Current River and Jacks Fork where boats can be launched, and designating which roads are open for travel.

In 2006, the NPS began the process of developing a new plan for the ONSR. On March 8, 2013, the NPS provided the FWS with the draft revised GMP and Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS"). As a result of this analysis, the NPS initially concluded that the revised GMP "may affect, but not likely to adversely affect" the Ozark hellbender, Indian bat and gray bat. See Memorandum dated March 18, 2013 from Bill Black, Superintendent, Ozark National Scenic Riverways, to Amy Salveter, Field Supervisor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

In a letter dated April 25, 2013, the FWS explained that it could not concur with the NPS's determination. The FWS recommended that NPS conduct "a programmatic consultation in which effects from all actions occurring within the park are evaluated." See Memorandum dated April 25, 2013 from Amy Salveter, Field Supervisor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to Bill Black, Superintendent, Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

On November 8, 2013, the NPS released the draft GMP, which is open for public comment until February 7, 2014.

#### Management of ONSR Affects the Endangered Ozark Hellbender

The Ozark hellbender is primarily affected by water quality, including sedimentation and nutrient loads. As such, any activities on the ONSR that impact water quality may in turn impact the salamander and its habitats. Ongoing activities near or on the riverways of the ONSR that deposit sediment or nutrient loads in waterways include: use of the road and trail system and recreational activities (such as boating, ATV use, and horseback riding). 76 Fed. Reg. 61,966. These activities in the rivers may also directly harm or disturb hellbenders or their cover rocks.

Studies conducted by the USGS (Barks 1978), NPS and the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (1998) have suggested that "heavy recreation use is causing adverse impacts on the water quality of the Jacks Fork River, including elevated fecal coliform bacteria densities that exceed the standard for whole body contact recreation" (Vana-Miller 2007). Indeed, in May 2011, ONSR was identified as one of America's ten most endangered rivers due to inadequate management by the NPS (American Rivers 2011).

Dirt and gravel roads within the Ozarks in general are the largest source of sediments to streams, outweighing the combined impacts of pasture erosion, logging, and natural erosion (Vana-Miller 2007, citing USDA 1986). Heavily used gravel roads can contribute 100 times more sediment than paved or abandoned roads (Reid and Dunne 1984). Roads can cause marginally stable slopes to fail, and they can capture surface runoff and channel it directly into streams resulting in increased sediment

deposition (Allan 1995). The 1991 NPS study of roads and trails found that the existing system of roads results in "substantial sediment loading to small creeks that empty into the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers," which reduces water quality and adversely impacts riparian vegetation (NPS 1991).

Over 130 motorized vehicular river-access points exist on the ONSR, according to a 2007 analysis (Friends of the Ozark Riverways 2010). Virtually all gravel bars (used for canoe and boat camping) are accessed by all-terrain vehicles (ATVs) and other motorized vehicles (American Rivers 2011). ORV activity also increases erosion and sedimentation by exposing bare erodible soils in areas with frequent activity. ORVs frequently cross rivers inhabited by hellbenders and are driven in riverbeds where the water is shallow enough to enable this form of recreation. ORV use in the riverways could also directly impact hellbenders, as well as displace cover rocks (76 Fed. Reg. 61,967). Horseback riding near or in the riverways can also increase sedimentation and nutrient loads and reduce available dissolved oxygen, as explained in detail below.

The practice of removing large rocks and boulders to reduce damage to canoes is common on many hellbender streams (76 Fed. Reg. 61,967). The areas under these large rocks are important habitat for cover and nest sites; therefore, overturning or removing these rocks can diminish available cover and nest sites for hellbenders. The force delivered by a boat hitting a rock could easily injure or kill a hellbender, in addition to displacing or disrupting cover rocks (76 Fed. Reg. 61,967). Indeed, hellbenders encountered with gashes in their heads suggest that watercraft traffic likely impacts these animals (76 Fed. Reg. 61,966). The NPS has found that "increased use of jet boats has created a more constant level of disturbance to aquatic and riparian animals as well as physical disturbance to bank and bottom substrates" (Vana-Miller 2007).

#### Horseback Riding Near and in Rivers Causes Adverse Impacts to the Ozark Hellbender

Impacts of horseback riding on the ONSR must be considered in the context of other horseback riding that contributes nutrients or sediments to the Current River and its tributaries, including illegal horseback riding in the ONSR and horseback riding outside the ONSR. As explained below, pressure from horseback riding in and near streams inhabited by Ozark hellbenders has increased substantially and may affect the amphibians by degrading the water quality of the riverways (76 Fed. Reg. at 61,967). It is also possible that horseback riding in the rivers may also directly harm or disturb hellbenders or their cover rocks.

#### Extent of Horseback Riding

Horseback riding in and near the ONSR is extensive. Currently, through an annually issued Supervisor's Compendium, NPS authorizes horseback riding by the public on unpaved state and county roads and four designated horse trails with designated river crossings. Within the ONSR, there are five designated river crossings on the Current River and two designated river crossings on Jacks Fork. The 2013 Supervisor's Compendium was approved on May 20, 2013, and is effective for one year. Supervisor's Compendium, [http://www.nps.gov/ozar/parkmgmt/upload/OZAR-Supt-Comp\\_051613\\_final-2013.pdf](http://www.nps.gov/ozar/parkmgmt/upload/OZAR-Supt-Comp_051613_final-2013.pdf) (last visited Sept. 27, 2013).

The four designated horse trails in the ONSR total approximately 23 miles (<http://www.nps.gov/ozar/planyourvisit/loader.cfm?csModule=security/getfile&PageID=164559>). Even just considering the four designated horse trails on the ONSR, there are several miles of trail where the proximity to the riverways would allow runoff of nutrients from horse waste or sedimentation through soil erosion.

Yet this only accounts for a fraction of miles of the available horseback riding routes because the NPS allows unlimited horse use of unpaved state and county roads. A 2000 analysis led by NPS found that within the 56-mile stretch of the Current from the upstream boundary to Goose Bay, there were 51 miles of horse trail running parallel to the river and on the flood plain, 83 percent of which were used exclusively for horse riding (Fenders 2011). There were nearly 30 miles of additional flood plain trail in other sections, in addition to numerous trails on higher ground (Fenders 2011). These trails include more than 80 places where horses cross the rivers and harm water quality with erosion and fecal coliform pollution (Fenders 2011). Moreover, when the water is low, many people use the river as a trail, riding along the river's edge.

In addition, the NPS authorizes commercial horseback riding operations through annual issuance of Commercial Use Authorizations ("CUAs"). For example, on July 26, 2012, the NPS authorized Trail Ride Guides LLC (aka

Cross Country Trail Rides) to use the Two Rivers confluence area of ONSR from Jerktail to below Two Rivers and up the Jacks Fork to the Alley Mill area. This essentially amounts to the entire designated horse trail system on the ONSR. On November 2, 2012, Trail Ride Guides LLC reported that it served approximately 10,000 clients and took about 20 trips in the ONSR that year, utilizing three designated horse trails: Broadfoot Loop, Jerktail Loop, and Shawnee Loop. Although the Commercial Use Authorizations limit group size for guided rides to 25, it is not uncommon to observe groups with several dozens of horses on unpaved roads and trails near and on the ONSR.

To illustrate the demand for horseback riding in the area, consider that Trail Ride Guides LLC, which is located on the banks of Jacks Fork, boasts over 3000 horse stalls (<http://crosscountrytrailrides.com/general-info/>). At one study site on the Jacks Fork, observers documented up to 500 horses crossing per hour (Davis and Richards 2002).

A 1991 NPS study of roads and trails found that about 95 percent of horse use in the ONSR is attributable to the large organized multi-day trail rides, such as those held by Trail Ride Guides LLC (NPS 1991). That study suggested that the NPS consider restricting the total number of horse riders by utilizing a permit system (NPS 1991).

### Impacts from Horseback Riding

The adverse impacts to the hellbender from horseback riding are caused primarily by erosion and sedimentation along the river and at river crossings, and manure being deposited into the river (76 Fed. Reg. at 61,966). Increased siltation may affect hellbenders in a variety of ways, such as suffocating eggs, eliminating suitable habitat for all life stages, reducing dissolved oxygen levels, increasing contaminants (that bind to sediments), raising water temperatures, impeding movements, and reducing prey populations. (76 Fed. Reg. at 61,966-67). Undoubtedly, sedimentation is a major threat to hellbenders (Quinn et al. 2013; Lawson 2012). Moreover, hellbenders require consistent levels of dissolved oxygen, which can be reduced when organic wastes like horse manure are deposited into waterways (76 Fed. Reg. at 61,957). Because hellbenders require high levels of water quality (e.g. Briggler et al. 2007), even minor alterations to stream habitat are likely to be detrimental to hellbender populations (76 Fed. Reg. at 61,964).

### Erosion and Sedimentation

Horseback riding can lead to erosion and sedimentation when horses' hooves dig into the soil, especially when descending steep banks at river crossings. Impacts caused by horses generally occur to a much greater degree than other trail users because the large weight of the horse is transferred to the ground at the hooves, which are relatively sharp points that easily dig into and loosen soils (Wilson and Seney 1994; DeLuca et al. 1998; Newsome et al. 2004). The hooves loosen soil particles that are mobilized and transported into waterways (Newsome et al. 2004).

The movement of soils from the trails often results in trail proliferation and widening as users seek to avoid deeply incised or wet areas of trail. Prolonged sedimentation can eventually decrease the water depth and cause changes in the water flow and temperature, which also may affect hellbenders.

Widespread erosion problems may also undermine the soil-rooting zone of nearby vegetation, causing localized loss of individual plants and an extension of the erosion problem, as the protective function of plant cover continues to be lost (Newsome et al. 2004). The destruction of this vegetative cover can result in excessive solar heating of the water. Increased temperature regimes can affect oxygen levels in the waterways and affect respiration of aquatic animals.

### Horse Wastes

Waste produced by horses ridden in and near waterways also affects Ozark hellbenders by increasing nutrient loads and reducing available dissolved oxygen. As a 2007 NPS report on water resources in the ONSR explains, "bodily wastes from animals is a major contamination threat to the park as well as a human health risk" (Vana-Miller 2007). For example, increased levels of nitrates (that reach waterways as surface runoff or leachate from horse manure) can affect amphibians by inhibiting growth, decreasing survivability, and impairing their immune systems (76 Fed. Reg. 61,966-67). Fecal coliform bacteria are present in horse manure and are indicative of potential viruses and pathogens that cause swimmer-associated sickness in water bodies. Also, when horses walk in the river, they stir up sediment. Bacteria tied up in the sediments can be released whenever the streambed sediment is disturbed (Missouri Dept. of

Natural Resources 2004; Marino and Gannon 1991). These water contaminants not only pose a threat directly to the Ozark Hellbender but also to the larger aquatic ecosystem and humans (see 76 Fed. Reg. 61,967).

There is evidence that horseback riding operations have degraded water quality in the ONSR (see, e.g., Emrie 1986; Vana-Miller 2007; Missouri Department of Natural Resources 2004). In 1998, a five-mile stretch of the Jacks Fork River from the town of Eminence to its confluence with the Current River was included on Missouri's list of impaired waters as required by Section 303(d) of the federal Clean Water Act. The identified pollutant on the Jacks Fork was fecal coliform bacteria, whose presence in large numbers indicated contamination by fecal wastes of warm-blooded animals (Davis and Richards 2001). The length of the impaired reach was increased to seven miles in 2002 because of data indicating the fecal coliform bacteria problem existed over a broader area (Davis and Barr 2006). From 2003 to 2008 the Missouri Department of Natural Resources again expanded the impaired stretch of the Jacks Fork, to eight miles (76 Fed. Reg. at 61,966). In 2002 at river mile 4.5 the annual coliform geometric mean was 26, and in 2009 it was 116 (Friends of the Ozark Riverways 2010).

The USGS conducted a three-phase study to better understand the extent and sources of microbiological contamination in the impaired reach. Davis and Richards (2001) found fecal coliform densities were generally larger in that reach and that the standard was exceeded at some sites. Data from Phase II (Davis and Richards 2002) indicated that, after accounting for wet-weather flow, the largest densities were during horse trail rides - this occurred in both water and streambed sediment samples. That study did not positively identify sources of contaminants but runoff from a commercial horse trail ride outfitter and horse stream crossings were identified as likely sources (76 Fed. Reg. at 61,966, citing Davis and Richards 2002, pp. 1, 3, and 36).

Phase III (Davis and Barr 2006) was an attempt to determine the causes and sources. The scientists found that increases in fecal coliform bacteria densities in the Jacks Fork are associated with cross-country horseback trail-riding events (Davis and Barr 2006). A total of 501 fecal coliform bacteria isolates were analyzed via a methodology that identifies presumptive sources of fecal bacteria in the Jacks Fork River - 70 isolates were from sewage, 132 to horses, 118 to cattle, and 181 unknown. In short, recreational users (including boaters and swimmers) are not the primary source of fecal coliform bacteria in the Jacks Fork; rather, the presence of fecal coliform bacteria is associated with other animals, of which horses are the primary sources (Davis and Barr 2006).

### Analysis of Alternatives

The "No Action" alternative is a description of current park management to serve as a baseline for comparison. Existing conditions include expanding presence of motorized vehicles, explosive growth of equestrian use, proliferation of undesignated trails and river access, overcrowding resulting in conflicts among user groups, and inadequate monitoring and enforcement of existing regulations. This alternative is unacceptable because it would result in further degradation of natural resources and the visitor experience.

Each of the action alternatives would provide some important benefits over the existing conditions. In particular, all of the action alternatives include: engaging in ecological restoration projects, such as closure of some undesignated roads, trails, and river access points; increasing law enforcement for compliance; maintaining Big Spring's primitive character; providing for non-motorized zones; preparing a recreational horse use and trail management plan; and establishing a permitting system, as necessary, to manage impacts of horse use. We are extremely supportive of these proposals. In particular, increases in law enforcement for compliance is important to stop illegal ORV activity, which increases erosion and sedimentation as explained above. Also, creation of non-motorized zones would result in less disturbance to the aquatic environment and would likely benefit the hellbender.

Yet the action alternatives vary in the extent to which they emphasize protection of natural resources. The NPS identified Alternative A as the environmentally preferred alternative, and the Center encourages the NPS to adopt Alternative A for the reasons explained below.

### Alternative A is More Protective of Water Quality than the NPS's Preferred Alternative B

Because undesignated roads and trails can contribute to water quality degradation through erosion and sedimentation, we support the NPS's proposals to close undesignated and illegal routes. Alternative A would restore 50 miles of such routes and Alternative B would restore 45 miles. In addition, Alternative A would replace 15 miles

of undesignated roads with hiking trails and Alternative B would replace 10 miles. Although both of these alternatives are a big improvement over the existing condition, Alternative A is more aggressive at addressing illegal and undesignated routes and should be adopted.

Equestrian overuse is a significant threat to water quality and the Ozark hellbender. As such, the Center is very pleased that all action alternatives will establish a permitting system, as necessary, to manage impacts of horse use. We believe that current impacts from horses, including river closures due to high bacteria levels, show that such a permitting system is absolutely necessary. Unlike Alternative B and Alternative C, Alternative A would not allow horse camping. We are extremely concerned that a large developed horse campground along Jacks Fork would have adverse impacts to water quality. We believe that adequate opportunities for horse camping already exist outside of the ONSR. In addition, a horse campground would attract additional use of the horse trail system, which is already strained from overuse.

Although we are pleased that all action alternatives would close and restore 65 miles of unauthorized horse trails and river crossings, all action alternatives would significantly expand the designated horse trail system, with Alternative A adding 25 miles and Alternative B adding 35 miles with new stream crossings. The NPS must use great caution when planning any additional stream crossings to ensure no adverse impacts to the hellbender. Plus, we strongly believe that such an expansion of the horse trail system cannot occur unless the impacts are fully analyzed, and we support preparing a recreational horse use and trail management plan under all action alternatives. In addition, the NPS must consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under the Endangered Species Act on how such horse management would impact the Ozark hellbender.

#### Suggested Changes to Action Alternatives

To reduce erosion and sedimentation, the NPS should emphasize restoring and stabilizing the riparian corridor. There should be no new conversions of bottomland riparian forests to open fields, and impaired and eroded riverbanks should be restored with native vegetation.

We appreciate that Alternative A prohibits motorized access to gravel bars, which could help reduce problems of erosion and aquatic disturbance at these sites. Under Alternative B, the NPS would designate which gravel bars are accessible by motor vehicle. If that alternative is selected, the NPS should be sure to locate these sites away from areas occupied by Ozark hellbenders. In addition, any new developed facilities along rivers should be considered only after analyzing impacts on water quality and Ozark hellbenders.

Some of the impacts to Ozark hellbenders are the result of unintentional but harmful human activities that could be modified with public education. For example, some canoeists move boulders to avoid collisions without realizing that they are destroying potential hellbender habitat. And some anglers kill hellbenders based on myths that they are poisonous and damage the sport fishery. We recommend that the NPS promote public education about the importance of hellbenders with various forms of outreach, such as signs and displays.

We are very concerned that the NPS lacks the funding and personnel to implement the expanded recreational use and new developments that are proposed under Alternatives B and C. The ONSR has seen a 30 percent reduction in staff in the last decade due to funding decreases, and NPS should hesitate to make changes to park management that would require increases in staff to monitor resources and provide enforcement to respond to increases in use.

We understand that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will be preparing an Endangered Species Act Section 7 biological opinion on the effects of the GMP on endangered wildlife within the ONSR, including the Ozark hellbender, Indiana bat, and gray bat. We are pleased that the NPS is consulting with the Service and recommend that the NPS adopt any mitigation measures recommended during consultation.

\*\*\*

For the above stated reasons, the Center recommends that NPS adopt Alternative A, which is the environmentally preferred alternative. We support the NPS's commitment to dealing with the serious problems from overuse that have developed on the ONSR. If you have any questions or would like to discuss these comments, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Collette Adkins Giese  
Reptile and Amphibian Senior Attorney  
Center for Biological Diversity

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2136    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 15:12:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
I support Alternatives A or B.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2137    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 15:14:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in full support of the no action plan. The riverways brings much needed revenue to our area and to restrict its use will reduce that revenue. Closing horse trails and roads will not good to the nearby towns. I have business owners tell me that they can tell when a trail ride is in the area as their sales go up. I have lived in this area all my life and see how it helps our economy. People plan whole family vacations around ridding these trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2138    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 15:18:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in favor of plan A. The Current River and Jacks Fork are two of the best float streams in the nation. People deserve a place to paddle canoes, kayaks, rafts, and tubes without having to worry about jet boats whizzing by in close proximity. I have nothing against motor boats on other rivers; however, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways should be a place to go where motor boats are not allowed or are very restricted. I have paddled in groups with children on Current River and have seen them frightened by motor boats going too fast or too close to them. No motor boats at all (or at least a 10hp limit) above Van Buren would be better than plan A.

If plan A is not selected, plan B would be better than doing nothing at all.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2139    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 15:25:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to add my agreement to the comments voiced by the Missouri Parks Association in support of Alternative B.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2140    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 15:26:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The River is such a wonderful resource. My family and friends have been enjoying the River for many years, spending alot of money on food, lodging and area activities.

We need to protect the water from pollutants. Run-off from the horse facilities located too close to the river need to be restricted. Excessive motor boat noise and water pollution needs to be restricted, especially on the upper areas of the Current River. I support the option C. Please work to preserve our National Scenic Riverway.

Thanks you for your wonderful work and the opportunity to provide feedback. I would appreciate if my address was not made available to the public. Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2141    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 15:30:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I live in St. Louis. I also own property on the river in the gap in Van Buren. I see both sides of the issues. This comment reflects my opinion.

I support ANY plan as long as current horsepower on boats is not effected. I think it was a mistake to bring HP into the discussion when presenting the plans.

If we are going to talk about the plans presented, I like ALT-A with no hp restrictions. However the real problem is that there are just too many people using the rivers on the weekend. There are too many boaters, too many floaters, too much noise. I can't even enjoy my own property in Van Buren on the weekends and I refuse to be there on a Saturday or Sunday afternoon in the summer....

I wouldn't mind paying a yearly expensive permit if it meant limiting the number of people on the river - even if it's up to a 1000 dollars a year. I believe that river is being raped by just too many people - period. And it is very sad to see. The noise pollution, the drunkenness, and the lack of appreciation for the beauty that surrounds us is disconcerting. People don't come for the beauty - but for a party. This has to stop. And I support anything that will help change this. Changing HP limits on boats won't do that.

My favorite thing to do on the river is to get in my 60/40 jet boat, and take it to a part of the river that is very quiet. I love to shut it down and float and just listen to the nature that surrounds me. I like to explore the backwaters and relax all day on the river. I love the peace and quiet.. That's what I want. Right now I'm not getting it unless I come on a weekday. Last year I didn't come to the park on a Saturday until after Labor Day. Does it really matter what HP I'm using in the middle of October with nobody on the river? Changing the HP limit just changes the size of my boat and what I can carry with me. It won't change my wake or the noise.

Find a way to eliminate the hoards of partiers on the weekend. Saturdays is when the river is over used. Don't let it keep happening. Stop the partying and alcohol abuse. Ban all alcohol. Stop the unnecessary noise. Limit the numbers of tubes. Limit the number of boats on the river at any one time (permits). Ban radios in boats and tubes and on gravel bars (except for emergency use). Preserve the freedom to travel the park by jet boat. As it stands, I support Alt-A WITHOUT any change to current HP limitations. Thanks for all you do. I know you have a tough job ahead of you with this GM plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2142 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 15:34:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a person who was born and raised on Current River! I am NOT somebody just giving a opinion that has never been on the rivers of this area! I have through out the years used the area involved in a way that has not destroyed it! I am known as a "LOCAL" We use it year around not just a weekend out of the year! Some people comment just because of an organization they belong to and have never been to our Beautiful area! I am a boating person but I have canoed also, and I am planning to do a trail ride this summer, so I think the boat H.P. should be left 40hp at the pump, the way it has been the last few years and everybody (with maybe a few extreme environmentalist) will continue to be able to use the area without a lot of new ONSR rules and regulations! I repeat NO NEW REGULATIONS NEEDED!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2143 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 15:35:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the extensive analysis of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and the detailed management options prepared by the National Park Service. I also thank you for this opportunity to comment. On weekends and summer trips our family enjoyed floating the clear waters of the Current and Jacks Fork in our aluminum canoe, swimming, exploring caves, picnicing on the gravel bars, photographing the scenic beauty. Our son also enjoyed float trips on the Current River with his Boy Scout Troop. Years later we shared the same experiences and joy with our grandchildren. In recent years we have been dismayed to learn, through pictures and letters, that up and down the river illegal roads and construction, a proliferation of ATVs, horse trails and powerful boat motors, have damaged gravel bars and riverbanks, caused severe erosion and degraded water quality - in essence spoiling the serenity, beauty, wildness and natural environment that people visit the Riverways for. I am concerned that the rivers are being loved to death.

There must be adequate regulation and adequate staff and funding to enforce those regulations.

I have studied the land and river management options, particularly Alternative B recommended by the NPS. While Alternative B would be an improvement over the status quo, I vote for Alternative A because it would provide the most protection and preservation of this national treasure for future generations. Specific reasons include:

- illegal roads will be closed and restored to natural conditions
- motor vehicles will be prohibited access to gravel bars
- reduces the number of horse trails and adds no new stream crossings
- 51% of the river will be non-motorized

In addition, I urge the Park Service to recommend that Congress designate Big Spring Wilderness. The area is primitive and wild, one of the few such areas remaining in the Ozarks. Its proximity to beautiful Big Spring, one of the largest in the world, makes it attractive for visitors to the Spring and Riverways. Protected as Wilderness, its wild character would be retained while being available to the public for hiking and other activities that "leave no footprint".

-

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2144    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 15:36:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** People from the Summersville have reported several concerns about the impact of the General Management Plan:

Churches which have previously had free access to the river for Baptisms will now be required to have a permit and pay a \$50.00 fee.

There will be a \$50.00 fee required of anyone taking photos within the park boundaries.

No private float craft will be allowed, only rental canoes and kayaks from federally licensed outfitters will be allowed on the river, (or parts of the river).

I have looked at the proposed plan and could see no specific mention of any of these things, yet people have claimed that NPS is already ticketing people for violations. Is there are truth whatsoever to these allegations?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2145    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 15:51:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern,

I put my personal information on this so feel free to contact me if you would like to discuss my comments. For the past five years I have worked at the Cross Country Trail Ride. I have met folks from all walks of life, they come from as far away as Colorado and some maybe further, to enjoy camping, horseback riding, canoeing, and tubing on the Jack's Fork River, and that is family entertainment at its finest. These folks don't sit at home using a computer, or playing video games like the rest of America. They enjoy getting out and enjoying the original social networking from years past. What you are planning to do is going to seriously impact a lot more folks than you realize. This from what I understand would basically put an end to this place. You do realize that your decisions affect not only local residents, but also folks from other parts of the country, have you made all of this information available to them as well? I imagine you have not contacted those Americans in other states to let them know what you are planning to do with their vacation spot. They will hear about it after the fact. As it states on "<http://www.nps.gov/ozar/parkmgmt/general-management-plan-information.htm>" and I quote, "The public has had many questions concerning park operations in the interim until the new General Management Plan is approved." That pretty much lets me know that you have already made your decision, and no matter what people, residents, or otherwise have to say, your plan will be approved. But I also think it was nice of you to put up a website to let us voice our opinions. It will be much appreciated after your plan is approved, no matter what the people have to say about it. This decision needs to be left up to the state, who would have a much better track record of keeping up with



things in its own back yard. Why does the Federal Government need to be involved in yet something else that takes away the peoples' rights to enjoy their own little piece of happiness. You are making decisions about this based on what you see on a piece of paper. I invite you to come and see for yourselves, just what your decision will be impacting. Meet the people face to face and if you have a conscience, you will not do this. Your decisions will be affecting livelihoods of the people that have built their lives in this area. I personally know some of these folks. They have been coming here for years, some up to 30 to 50 years, making a lifelong family tradition of coming from other states to enjoy this area of Missouri. Why anyone would want to ruin this tradition of family values is beyond me. I sincerely hope that you will reconsider what you are planning to do to this area. These are the folks I believe should decide, the ones that live there, and others that visit there on a regular basis, not you, you neither live there or visit there ever, so why do you get to decide what is done with their land? This isn't right. That's just my two cents on the matter. This is just another opinion that either won't be read, or will be discarded as soon as it is read. I thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion nonetheless.

John Colbert  
327 McFall St.  
Benton IL. 62812  
618-922-7299

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2146    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 15:55:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have seen where the House of Rep. in Mo. HCR8 is being submitted to encourage the park service to use the no action plan. Every elected official I have talked to is for the no action plan. I have thought a lot about this and missed a lot of sleep trying to make some sense of the various plans and I can not. If I could never ride a horse again I would still be for the no action plan. As far as the permit system and user fee I think I already pay for it in taxes. I have rode the existing trails looking for damage and manure and I find very little. Whispering Pines horse camp will go out of business if trails are closed. Not only do we camp at horse camps but also always canoe. I am a Viet Nam veteran and am sad to see where the park service does not want me to be on a so called social trail and visit with friends and make new ones. The word social trails is thrown around very loosely in the report. I also believe that closing roads would create safety concerns for all users. This riverway is for all of us to use. I am very happy to see canoes and boats on the river because life is short and we should all enjoy. Special interest groups always stir the pot but we locals as we are called do not try and force our way on them in their back yard.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2147    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 16:18:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To all whom it may concern:

As a life long resident of the great state of Missouri I myself, my family as well as many of my friends regularly enjoy the Beauty and freedom that is The Ozark National Scenic Riverways. We regularly enjoy Camping, riding horses, and Jet Boating on and near the Jacks Fork and the Current Rivers. I strongly oppose the proposal of an additional unnecessary Management plan and view it as another bureaucratic intrusion of a God Given Heritage that would further limit the traditional forms of recreation that the local residents of this region have enjoyed for generations.

There for I would like to register my opinion that the Management plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways should be at least left as it is.

Sincerely,

Lonnie Scott  
Sullivan MO.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2148    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 16:23:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you, in advance, for considering my comments. I support Alternative A of the Draft EIS.

In light of increasing population, ever-encroaching development, competition for resources, expanding noise levels, and diminishing integrity of natural values generally, it is essential to protect and restore the outstanding characteristics of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Alternative A provides our citizens with a place of refuge and respite from the pressures of modern life without compromising the resource itself. The State contains many other resources and locations that allow ample access to a broad range of commercial uses and recreational activities. Alternative A offers the best hope that successive generations will be able to enjoy the tranquility and beauty of this natural resource.

Sincerely submitted.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2149	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 16:23:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My family business is located on Current River in Van Buren, Missouri and we operate the following National Park Concessions on the Lower Current River section:				

The Landing Canoe Rental - OZAR024  
Hawthorne Canoe Rental - OZAR023  
Big Spring Canoe Rental - OZAR025  
Current River Outfitters - OZAR010  
Current River Outfitters (Tubes) - OZAR049

These five concessions are responsible for approximately 95% onon-motorized watercraft rentals for the Lower Current River each year since the only other concession for the Lower Current River is a 75 Tube only concession. This proposed General Management Plan will have a profound effect on these concessions as it is currently written. Below are the statements and positions of this proposed GMP that are of great concern to this concessioner as to the management direction for the Lower Current River. This concessioners comments follow each numbered statement.

1. The 1989 plan developed standards for the maximum number of canoes by river section and provided for monitoring and review of concession operations in order to achieve canoe standards. PAGE 96

Concessioner Comment: This statement is specifically limited to canoes and review of concession operations regarding canoes.

2. To better reflect changing watercraft use patterns on the riverways, particularly the greater diversity of watercraft, this general management plan applies the standards set in the 1989 plan for canoes to include all watercraft (motorized and non-motorized) PAGE 96

Concessioner Comment: It is agreed that there are different watercraft use patterns now than there were prior to the 1989 plan implementation, however I take issue of applying the 1989 standards for canoes to all watercraft. I think that this is a great leap to conclusion without further studies of watercraft other than canoes. This plan would be better served to set forth additional studies in the future for watercraft other than canoes, and to establish individual standards for motorized and non-motorized watercraft instead of arbitrarily placing them within the 1989 canoe standards.

3. Visitor counts and interviews were conducted at five river access points in 1998 and 2001. These points included Watercress, Van Buren Bridge, Big Spring canoe access, Big Spring boat access, and Cataract Landing. BROWN AND CHILMAN 1998 AND 2001 STUDIES PAGE 204

Concessioner Comment: The 1998 and 2001 studies did not assess Chilton Creek (Waymeyer) access and two of the accesses studied (Watercress and Van Buren Bridge) are not located within the park service boundaries. Following my comment for number two above in regard to further studies in the future, better results would surely be obtained if the Chilton Creek access would be placed in the study if density guidelines are to be set for this access down to

Big Spring. Also it is apparent to this concessioner that studies conducted at points outside the NPS boundaries should not be used to draw conclusions that would lead to density guidelines.

4. The areas of the greatest activity for non-motorized river users included Akers Ferry, Cedargrove, and Pulltite. Waymeyer is also a busy location for non-motorized watercraft users, but this is not reflected in table 20 because visitors who launched at Waymeyer ended their trip in the gap outside the NPS Riverways boundary, typically in the Town of Van Buren (Park 2011). PARK STUDIES IN 2010 PAGE 204

Concessioner Comment: This study by Park in 2010 is indicated in this plan to be a study that substantiated the 1998 and 2001 studies and thereby concludes that the Chilton Creek to Big Spring river section use levels have dramatically increased. This study not only indicates that Akers Ferry, Cedargrove and Pulltite access points have the greatest activity for non-motorized river users, but again does not include Chilton Creek (Waymeyer) in the study. How can this study that eliminates the Chilton Creek (Waymeyer) access for study substantiate the 1998 and 2001 studies that also eliminated the Chilton Creek access in their study? I have a great deal of trouble in accepting a study that specifically states that three other access points on the river have greater activity of river users than Chilton Creek (Waymeyer) and the three unsubstantiated studies taken together leads to the conclusion in number five below.

5. Use patterns at the NPS Riverways have changed over the past 30 years, but overall use levels have not varied dramatically, with the exception of the section of river from Chilton Creek to park unit boundary north of Watercress. Most of the current watercraft use levels (such as for canoes, kayaks, motorboats, and tubes) for the majority of river sections are within the use levels established by the 1989 plan (Park 2011). The Chilton Creek to Watercress section (within park unit boundaries) is above the use levels established in the 1989 plan. Other exceptions exist along the riverways, but are few and occur only on weekends during peak season. PAGE 97

Concessioner Comment: This statement totally excludes all river sections except the Chilton Creek to park unit boundary north of Watercress. I cannot accept that the 1998, 2001 and 2010 studies conclude that this section of the river is above the use levels established in the 1989 plan when the CHILTON CREEK ACCESS IS NOT INCLUDED IN ANY OF THE STUDIES. This statement also includes an admission that Other exceptions exist along the riverways, but are few and occur only on weekends during peak season. This admission excludes any other section of the river with the excuse that the crowding only occurs on weekends during peak season. This is a contradictory statement when anyone who is at all familiar with the Chilton Creek to Watercress river section knows that any crowding that occurs will be on weekends during peak season.

Concessioners are required to submit Monthly Visitation Reports on the 25th day of each month based on daily river counts of non-motorized vessels that are rented by the concessioner. In order to submit these reports in an accurate and timely fashion, this concessioner keeps an excel spreadsheet that reflects actual daily rentals taken from the concessioners individual rental agreements. For the past four years the daily use averages for fourteen weeks are as follows:

SATURDAYS - 1,123 VESSELS PER SATURDAY RENTED FOR CHILTON CREEK TO VAN BUREN BRIDGE.

SUNDAYS THROUGH FRIDAYS - 133 VESSELS PER DAY RENTED FOR THESE SIX DAYS.

The concessioners actual physical rental agreement cards that are in the possession of OSNR concession officials can verify this data. I maintain from this actual data that any crowding issues for the Chilton Creek to NPS boundary north of Watercress would be strictly limited to Saturdays in Peak Season. Currently and in the past this concessioner has offered weekday discounts in order to try to lessen the weekend impact, as well as other incentives. The most important question then follows:

Why is this management plan not using actual concessioner statistics reported to the Park Service on a regular basis that are available to the people formulating the plan instead of making assumptions based on suspect studies and interviews?

6. The only changes in application of the standards set in the 1989 use management plan is to apply the standards to

all watercraft and to amend the direction for the river section from Chilton Creek to the park unit boundary north of Watercress. PAGE 97

Concessioner Comment: So from a combination of the above mentioned studies and the inclusion of all watercraft into the 1989 canoe use standards the only changes that are specifically implied in this plan is in number six above. As stated before I believe this to be a great leap to a conclusion based on no established substantive information. Instead of making that statement part of this plan, I believe further studies of specific watercraft at specific times on this section of the river are needed. It is apparent in this plan that the Chilton Creek to Big Spring river section has been specified for guidelines based on conclusions with no substantive facts established from suspect study results.

Again: Why is this management plan not using actual concessioner statistics reported to the Park Service on a regular basis that are available to the people formulating the plan instead of making assumptions based on suspect studies and interviews?

7. The 1989 plan identified this section (referring to Chilton Creek to Watercress) as medium use. This general management plan would reassign this section of river from a medium use to high use section, as defined in the 1989 plan. That plan defined high use zones as social park settings with moderate to high development and visitation and allowed up to 70 canoes per mile. Converting this section of river to a high use zone is more consistent with the desired conditions established for this area in the general management plan. This standard will apply to all watercraft and will allow for a higher level of use than the 1989 plan, but is below current use levels in this section of river. This reduction in use&&&&. PAGE 97

Concessioner Comment: It is evident that this plan based on unsubstantiated data is singling out Chilton Creek to Big Spring river section for use reassignment.

In doing so it is actually reducing river use even though it is reassigning this section to a high use zone. I maintain that there can be no conclusions for action regarding this section of the river without further study and deliberation as to specific watercraft use and timing of this river section use. This brings us to number eight below, which outlines reduction possibilities.

8. The following watercraft reduction possibilities are further outlined on PAGE 97 to include:

Assigning a percentage to the amount of time the river section will need to be within standard.

An education outreach program to encourage voluntary dispersal of use on the rivers to reduce the number of watercraft in certain popular areas.

If needed watercraft permits may also be required.

Also current concessioner contracts or operating plans may be evaluated and modified to better distribute and manage the number of watercraft, both across times of day and by physical location.

Concessioner Comment: I question the legality of modifying concession contracts. These are 10-year contracts between concessioners and the National Park Service. The contracts are based on specific watercraft allotments and the use of these watercraft. Any modification of that would severely impact a concessioners day-to-day operation and cause severe economic hardship on that concessioners business, and would be construed as tortuous interference of a contract. That possibility for watercraft reduction should absolutely not be implemented into this plan, and that wording should be entirely removed from the final plan.

9. Most visitors to the NPS Riverways rent their non-motorized watercraft from NPS Riverways-approved concessioners and then return them at the end of their trip. However, over the past 20 years, the number of non-motorized river users bringing their own equipment has steadily increased. If the number of private non-motorized users on the river continues to increase at a similar rate, issues related to crowding and conflicts would also likely increase. PAGE 96

Many of the visitors to the NPS Riverways use concessioner services to access the river. However, there appears to be an increase in the number of river users who are bypassing the concessioners. PAGE 202

Concessioner Comment: As stated before, concession contracts are based on specific watercraft allotments and the use of these watercraft. These watercraft allotments have not changed since the establishment of the concessions in Ozark National Scenic Riverways, ie, the watercraft allotments for the five concessions that we operate have not changed since the inception of these contracts. Concessioners are bound by the allotments and the use thereof, so it follows that a concessioner cannot exceed these allotments of watercraft to be rented for river use. This would be a significant violation of the contracts. One would have to conclude from the above statements that if concession users of watercraft cannot increase, then if there is crowding on weekends during peak floating season it would have to be a result of outside equipment being brought in for river use by private individuals. The two statements above specifically verify this.

10. Concession drop-off and pickup locations for river users utilizing non-motorized watercraft would be redistributed to reduce peak-season crowding. This would require closure and restoration of about 20 access points and the careful design and opening of 20 new designated access points. PAGE 69

Concessioner Comment: A concessioner use only launch access could be constructed above the Waymeyer access and would not only relieve the access point crowding but would also spread the density of floaters over a larger section of the river. This concessioner business has been operating a floating operation on Current River since 1979 and became an NPS Concessioner in 1984. This concessioner business has a sound understanding of watercraft river use on the Lower Current River due to the 34 years of float business operations. This concession has had a good working relationship with Ozark National Scenic Riverways and has always maintained satisfactory annual evaluations for all of the years as a concessioner. Since we are responsible for approximately 95% of the watercraft rental business in the Chilton Creek to Big Spring river section, it would only make sense that in regard to non-motorized river use this concessioner should have a great deal of input as to how better reach the river use goals of Ozark National Scenic Riverways in this section of Current River. I stand ready to work with current and future park administration to reach these river use goals. Because of our experience in this float business on this section of Current River I believe we can be exceptionally helpful to park administration if they will consider some of our proposals for river use disbursement on this river section for the future.

CONCLUSION: Operating five of the six concession contracts on the Lower Current River and being constrained to the specific use of the Waymeyer to Big Spring river section, it is apparent that this plan will have a profound impact to our concession operations in this area. With this section of the river being singled out in this plan for guidelines, we believe that further studies using actual data of specific non-motorized watercraft use should be undertaken. Our 35 years of experience in providing floating opportunities on this river section make us very qualified to partner with the administration of Ozark National Scenic Riverways to better establish non-motorized watercraft use guidelines. This plan should allow for that partnership to prosper and provide an avenue for discussions and implementation of guidelines that would be beneficial to both NPS and the Lower Current River concessioners.

Again for Emphasis: Why is this management plan not using actual concessioner statistics reported to the Park Service on a regular basis that are available to the people formulating the plan instead of making assumptions based on suspect studies and interviews?

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2150	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 16:31:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support the No-action alternative and continuation of the current management plan. The current plan has the flexibility to address all issues associated with the management of the riverways.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2151	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 16:31:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support the No-action alternative and continuation of the current management plan. The current plan has the flexibility to address all issues associated with the management of the riverways.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2152	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 16:32:24				

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the No-action alternative and continuation of the current management plan. The current plan has the flexibility to address all issues associated with the management of the riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2153 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 16:32:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the No-action alternative and continuation of the current management plan. The current plan has the flexibility to address all issues associated with the management of the riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2154 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 16:33:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the No-action alternative and continuation of the current management plan. The current plan has the flexibility to address all issues associated with the management of the riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2155 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 16:36:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The National Scenic Riverways should be protected at all cost. That is the purpose of it designation as a National Park. Activities that have a negative effects on the rivers should be opposed. It took a lot of work to establish the scenic riverways; we should protect them at all cost.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2156 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 16:38:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am 86 years old. I was raised two and a half miles from the upper Jacks Fork river. My Dad and I would walk to the river and spend the day or night fishing. We would clean and wrap the fish in a wet gunny sack and carry them home for a great meal. Sometimes the family would take the team and wagon to the Granny Hole on the North Prong to spend the night camping and fishing.

My Dad went from door to door asking people to write their congressman to support the creation of the Riverways back in the 1960's.

I started floating on the lower Jacks Fork and on the Current river in the late fifties. There were few canoes, mostly john boats. Some had small motors. It was beautiful and so quiet.

I am pleased that people can hunt and gig fish. I enjoy watching the gigging when we are camped on the river. It takes me many years back.

I have been retired for thirty years. My wife, friends and I go floating several times each year. We particularly enjoy going before Memorial day and after Labor day.

I do not like the jet boats running full speed up and down the river. They are too loud and waves erode the banks and are destroying invertebrate habitat when they leave marks in the shallows.

The Riverways was created by compromising on many points. I believe Plan B does this and although it does not cover all the things that I would like done it is a (fair for all plan).

Thank you for your good work.

Jack ( John ) Toll

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2157 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 16:54:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The plan that I like the most is Alternative B (the NPS preferred), although I do not agree with making a learning center at Powder Mill. The learning center should be somewhere like Round Spring or Alley - a place that gets more visitation. Powder Mill is a ways out of the way for most visitors and the visitor contact station/ranger station at Powder Mill has been closed for a while because it didn't get enough use. Opening a learning center there won't change the visitation at that site all that much.

I do not like Alternative A - the change nothing alternative. I grew up in the Ozarks and very much appreciate the park and don't want the park to be damaged because nothing was done to rehabilitate areas of high impact. That is also why I don't really like Alternative C either. I don't think it's right that some areas are going to be 'written off' because they have higher use than other areas.

I believe the Alternative B is the best choice because it best falls in line with the Organic Act and with the Park Service's goals of making park sites open for the enjoyment of the public while protecting and preserving those sites for the enjoyment and education of future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2158 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 17:14:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** After looking at all the plans I feel that I must support the no action plan. Any other plan could have adverse effect our local economy. I have spent several dollars over many years enjoying the river. The area involved in the plans have very low income and if you reduce where canoes can be put in or where people can camp you are inviting trouble and also people will not come back. The horse trails are very nice and I see very limited damage. Closure could also make for reduced income to the surrounding towns.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2159 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 17:24:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Take no action on any of the plans. The Rivers are a major economic boost for the tourism of Missouri. Out of state interests are behind changing the management plan to exclude or limit the use of said rivers and their banks, including camping, boating, fishing, hiking, horse trails, etc. The Current River Basin and Jacks Fork Rivers of Missouri are not in danger like some extremist environmental groups would lead you to believe. The current use of the river for recreation is already a good balance. So take no action on any new plans. Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2160 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 17:34:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support alternatives A or B.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2161 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 17:41:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I agree with what the National Park Service is proposing for the National Scenic Riverway. As a person who has frequented the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, I have been dismayed by the disregard some visitors have for the natural beauty of the area. The off roaders have no business in this natural area, destroying the tranquility and scenic areas. The equestrians should stay on trails designated by the Service. Trails for hikers and equestrians do not mix well.

Thank you for taking the initiative to preserve this natural area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2162 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 17:46:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Bottom Line -

Support and enforce the current policies. I see no reason to make any changes based on my observation of how the

ONSR is currently being managed. Enforce what is currently in place and quit wasting my tax dollars on re-writing what is already there. I have used and enjoyed the ONSR all of my life. Don't re invent the wheel.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2163    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 17:55:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Take No Action....

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2164    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 17:58:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support alternative A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2165    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 17:59:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** All 3 alternates in the plan state that "Camping would be allowed only on designated gravel bars and away from the river." This should be re-worded to make clear that canoe camping is not restricted to these areas.

I favor Alternate A that restricts the horsepower and numbers of motorboats allowed on the rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2166    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 18:03:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I want NO ACTION plan, continue with present access to area

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2167    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 18:23:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There are way too many boats allowed on the river during the peak summer months. The trash is a sad thing to see. Please do all you can to improve the environmental conditions and limit the boating and atv activities on the National Riverways property!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2168    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 18:37:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would be in favor of the NPS favored "Alternative B'. I have spent time in the Riverways for more than 30 years. I have had the pleasure of getting to know both locals and people from across the country who serve with the NPS. I have become disheartened in recent years with the attitude of some local groups who see the NPS as the enemy and see the park as a resource to be strip mined. I'm afraid a lot of these folks don't care what happens to or in the park as long as they can make a buck until there is nothing left. The park was set aside for all Americans, not as the personal money making resource of a few. I think "Alternative B' is a good compromise and addresses concerns held by all.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2169    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 18:46:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No Action

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2170    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 18:48:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO ACTION

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2171    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208



**Received:** Feb,05,2014 18:49:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No Action.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2172 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 19:11:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO ACTION

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2173 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 19:12:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the ONSR draft General Management Plan. I have been a resident of the Ozarks for 34 years and have met with every ONSR manager since 1979. At one time the Eleven Point River was part of my responsibility and many of the issues facing the ONSR were common concerns.

I firmly believe Alternative B would go a long way toward correcting many of the things that have befallen the Riverways. I think every park service employee and manager I have talked with through the years would also express this position, although many could not take the required actions. Alternative B would take the actions needed to protect the resources and have minimum impact on the local citizens.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2174 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 19:18:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO ACTION plan is best. I do not want more restrictions that will limit camping, canoeing & enjoying nature and add fees, licenses & permits.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2175 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 19:52:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It was my pleasure, as a young man, to fish both the Current and Jacks Fork rivers. I moved to the Ozarks over 40 years ago and took a job on Pioneer Forest, now owned by the LAD Foundation. I have spent many enjoyable days on the Riverways. During that time I have been disturbed by the gradual but steady increase in inappropriate use. There has been a substantial increase of vehicular traffic on unauthorized roads and horse riding on undesignated trails, both of which have caused steady degradation of the lands in the river corridor. There has also been a continual loss of funding and reduction of staff, which makes it difficult to properly manage the Riverways.

I firmly believe that these problems can best be addressed with Alternative B, together with support for additional funding by the regional and national NPS offices.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2176 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 19:54:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the thought that has gone into developing this plan. As an avid user of National Parks all around the country, I prefer Alternative A.

This park is unique in protecting a river. I have canoed the river and visited the springs, and found them to be among the most beautiful that I've seen in this country. Like other beautiful areas, we need to plan for centuries of use. Alternative A seeks to stop illegal trails and use of the parks (which should be non-controversial) and make the best effort to preserve the natural beauty for the benefit of every U.S. citizen, for whom this park was created. Any steps not taken now will require more and harder work later. Let's not create bigger hurdles down the road; we should do the right thing now.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2177 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 20:08:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The proposed Alternative B plan is a concern to us personally. In our opinion the plan would create a hardship to the economy and citizens of our area. Due to the harsh restrictions in Alternative B, some implications we perceive include the impact on local businesses such as grocery stores, restaurants, gas stations, tire repair shops, tourist attractions such as canoe rentals, fishing supply shops, hotels, motels, trail rides, and camp grounds due to the lack of tourists being drawn to our area. Our area is limited due to lower populations and the amount of land owned by the State of Missouri and timber companies.

First of all, our business, Big Creek Trail Ride, is a four generation family owned and operated establishment. A major impact to our personal business is the concern of eliminating some of the horse trails on Current River. Not knowing where the 65 miles of horse trails will be eliminated is a concern to our financial welfare and stability. We have invested 16 years in building a business to accomodate tourists in and around the state of Missouri to come and ride their horses in the beauty of the Ozarks. Our business generates a considerable amount of sales tax for the state of Missouri. In addition, local businesses benefit from our customers by serving their needs during the week long stay at Big Creek Trail Ride.

Secondly, our family heritage and traditions of fishing, gigging, and boating will be ceased by the restrictions of no motorboats from Cedar Grove to Pulltite. We would be comfortable with a seasonal usage of allowing motorboats on Current River from Labor Day Weekend to Memorial Day. This would allow a season for canoeists and floaters to be on the river in the absence of motorboats.

Thirdly, we foresee a problem of limiting the number of accesses on Current River. The limitation will create more congestion in the access areas. We propose that the current accesses be patrolled more closely by law enforcement and stiff fines.

Lastly, it is our wish that the NPS work more closely with area groups, citizens, & businesses. Businesses and local individuals are eager to donate personal time to work with the NPS on projects such as building & maintaining trails, hitching rails, trash and river cleanup, and the restoration of historical sites just to name a few.

In closing, it is our wish that this ordeal can be rectified to benefit Current River, the local citizens and local business owners in this area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2178    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 20:15:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of no change on the Current River. I have spent countless time up and down the banks of the Current River in all seasons by all means of transportation. The areas in the proposed change do not need any more regulation. In my 25 years of experience on the river, the local residents have dedicated their time to keep the river clean and useable for others to enjoy. Residents in the proposed area of change would find benefits from harming the river with pollutants and destruction of its banks. Instead residents spend time picking up litter and cleaning up the river from pieces left behind by the many visitors Current River encounters so future generations can continue to enjoy the river. My self, along with many other boaters and local river-goers, have used our means to help rescue visitors from drowning while floating on the Current River on a weekly basis. If research shows that local residents are harming the river I would recommend taking a look at the harm that comes from the thousands of tourist that float the river on a weekend. The majority of tourist are careless in what effect they have on the river that they visit once a year. Regulating river access points and turning driving trails into hiking only areas is taking away from local residents who have enjoyed this land for generations. I am young and able to hike today but I do plan on spending my lifetime in Carter County. There will come a day when my parents, me, my future generations will not be physically able to access the river by any other form than boat or vehicle. I find it hard to believe that it is possible that my hometown could soon be an area that takes away from those who have spent their years contributing to the area finically and physically. I hope to see many more local generations enjoy the Current River with the freedom that I have been able to enjoy it with in my lifetime. I believe in no further change in regulations on the Current River.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2179    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 20:41:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been kayaking on the Current and Jacks Fork rivers over the last few years, and it is the stunning beauty, the clean water, and chance to camp in this environment that brings me back. However, I have seen signs of overuse and degradation. Last year I saw a deeply incised trail that had been caused by horses using a trail near the river. I have often seen horses crossing the river as well. Horses are heavy animals with sharp destructive hooves and they can't help the destruction they cause. And of course there is the e. coli pollution they leave behind as well. Although I have not seen ATVs, I have heard them and it totally destroys one of the best reasons for frequenting these parks - PEACE. There's no way to feel peaceful with the racket they create.

It's a good thing you are planning to improve management of these parks. I hope you will go for the most protective option - Alternative A. If you allow continued overuse and abuse, the very reasons these areas are so attractive will be lost.

Thanks,  
Susan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2180    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 20:45:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I was born and raised in Jadwin near the current river and have camped, swam, and horseback rode the for many years and still do. I have looked all plans and find there really is not much solid information in any of them so I think the best is the no action plan. Working in a retail store in salem for over 30 years I can first hand tell you of the value of the tourism industry. Without this money salem and other towns would be hurt. I see any plan but the no action plan hurting the canoe and horse industry. I doubt any park service employee has ridden any of the horse trails to see what they are like. I also witness first how poorly the park has maintained the trails in the Emience area. We can not let a special interest group control the river and the surrounding land.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2181    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 20:46:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Alternative A to the Management Plan. The extra protection from illegal roads, reduced motor boat traffic and other measures to return the river corridors to more historic beauty is my understanding of Alternative A.  
I hope to work on projects with the NPS when the new plan is implemented.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2182    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 20:47:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I was born and raised in Jadwin near the current river and have camped, swam, and horseback rode the for many years and still do. I have looked all plans and find there really is not much solid information in any of them so I think the best is the no action plan. Working in a retail store in salem for over 30 years I can first hand tell you of the value of the tourism industry. Without this money salem and other towns would be hurt. I see any plan but the no action plan hurting the canoe and horse industry. I doubt any park service employee has ridden any of the horse trails to see what they are like. I also witness first how poorly the park has maintained the trails in the Emience area. We can not let a special interest group control the river and the surrounding land.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2183    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 20:52:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Greetings,

We would like to express our support for Alternative B. Over the past 25 years, my wife and I, along with friends have spent many days canoeing on the Current and Jacks Fork rivers and we are familiar with these areas and the

typical use patterns. We have been on the river during all seasons and have spent many nights camped on gravel bars enjoying the solitude and natural beauty. Some of our fondest trips occur when we are fortunate enough to find ourselves alone on the river and we treasure these moments. Many times we plan our trips to avoid crowds and active boaters so that we can have a more relaxing experience. It would be a shame to allow these unique and fragile resources to become overused and thus degraded; at some point they would become nothing like the beautiful, natural wonders they currently are.

Some trips have been among numerous other boaters including canoes and motorboats and when each of these groups treats each other with respect, the experience can be pleasant. Other times the number of boaters or their raucous behavior distracts from our enjoyment. This is true of those canoeists that treat the river like a party zone and also motorboaters whose driving habits can be dangerous. We have witnessed motorboat users driving past canoeists without lowering their wakes causing canoes to become unstable. I am aware that in some places in the river the boats must maintain enough speed to stay 'on plane' to avoid engine damage. If a motorboat suddenly encounters a canoeist on a curve, this could lead to a very dangerous collision. I would suggest that areas of the river that are not deep enough for a motorboat to safely navigate at low speed should be areas that are off limits to those kinds of boats. I am not suggesting a total ban on motorized boats, just a responsible recognition that there are some reaches where they should not be driven.

We support the wise stewardship of this area and feel that limiting some types of use is important to maintain the pristine character of the resource. ONSR is a resource that should be preserved for continued use and managed to ensure that detrimental practices do not occur. Thank you for undertaking this effort and presenting the results of your study to the public. We hope that this process is successful in finding a balance that will be acceptable to all concerned.

Regards,

Bill and Barbara Winston

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2184    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 20:55:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO ACTION

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2185    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 21:01:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to let you know that as a horse owner and rider I find that many parks are squeezing out the horseback rider. I understand managing trails is a difficult thing and closing some trails have to happen from time to time. I really would like to see the new alternate trails opened before closing any existing trails. I want to continue riding in the wonderful state of Missouri for many years to come. Please consider my proposal of adding trails before you take away any.  
Thank you for your time.  
Cheryl

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2186    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 21:02:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am supportive of your Alternative B for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I think it will be a good balance and will improve the park in many ways. It's been a few years since I've been in that area, but I had an opportunity to study there for one week. We toured many of the amazing features of area around the Current River. This is an amazing treasure that we have in our state, in our country, and it needs to be managed well. I'm happy to see that more opportunities for people to learn about the features is planned, as well as cutting back on so many roads, and providing better access points. Anything that can be done to minimize the impact of the horse traffic will also be an improvement.

Thank you for your part in putting the options together for better stewardship for our ONSR gem.

Sincerely,  
Karen B. Meyer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2187    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 21:30:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I recently traveled from Orlando, FL to see the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers. It was my first visit to the Rivers, and immediately I recognized the importance and benefit of their protection. I have never seen rivers as clear and clean as the Jacks Fork and Current. In my opinion, the quality of the water and surrounding environment is the most important feature of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Ten minutes after I arrived to Big Spring, I sighted three bald eagles and multiple deer. My expectations were met when I visited the Riverways, and I want to ensure the area is protected for generations to come.

I support Alternative A, because it provides greater opportunities for traditional, nonmechanized forms of recreation and visitor experiences that are quieter, less crowded, and slower paced. (Executive Summary of Alternative A.) I value preservation and setting aside a significant portion of the land as primitive zone and zoning a significant section of the river as nonmotorized can achieve it. Alternative A provides that [v]isitors would have opportunities to float secluded stretches of the river where they would not have to experience the sights and sounds of motorized boats or vehicles. The seclusion and quiet are the aspects of floating a river that I value and are the aspects that would encourage me to return. Motorboats on the river are disruptive as they interfere with my aesthetic enjoyment of the river. I understand they are a method of recreation that many enjoy, but I think the approved motorized zoning should be limited. Alternative A limits motors to 40 horsepower (and enforces existing regulations), but my primary concern is the percentage of the river that is designated as nonmotorized. Having 51% of the river-based zone set aside as nonmotorized provides the experience I seek out when choosing a park to visit.

Additionally, I prefer Alternative A because it sets aside 26.8% of the land as primitive. In Alternative A, the location of primitive and natural zoning would increase the amount of hiking trails. Nearly 15 miles of roads in the primitive zone would be removed and replaced with hiking trails. Setting aside additional land as primitive, restoring natural conditions of roads, and adding hiking trails increases the likelihood that many visitors will experience the quiet and solitude they seek when visiting the Riverways.

In regards to the NPS roads and river access points, I think it is important at the NPS seek[s] to establish a partnership with the counties regarding road management, including closures. Creating opportunities for local counties to participate in this management process will likely increase the probability of compliance of accessing the river at designated sites. I was disappointed when I saw tracks from off-road vehicles near the banks of the river and in flood-plain areas. Although the tracks may have been caused by recreational off-roading, they also may have been caused from launching a boat from the banks. It is important that there are enough access points to the river to ensure that visitors have the ability to access the river without damaging the surrounding environment. I prefer Alternative B in this regard, because it provides additional official access sites. I believe this will limit unauthorized access and continue to protect the Rivers.

I will travel from Florida to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, because the water is pristine and it provides the opportunity to canoe in a peaceful setting. Just as important as the quality of the water is the protection of the surrounding environment. There are many parks and places of recreation, but few are protected in the manner such as the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. This is a precious resource protected for the public. When I return to the Riverways, I hope to find it in even better condition than when I visited it this January. Thank you for all you do to protect the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. It is a gift to all!

Samantha Spencer  
Orlando, FL

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2188    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 21:31:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

I am a long time user of the Missouri Rivers. I do not feel that the word user is a bad term either. I take care of the rivers I float and believe that is the Norm for most that are on them. They were put there by a higher form, or at least not by any person who might feel that putting restrictions on them is there job. So I am writing to say that I do not believe anyone has the right nor the reason to take away any freedom that has to do with them and that, that just makes sense.

The rivers of Missouri are one of the only resources it has to offer. There is absolutely nothing that the Government can do that we, the collectively smart and intelligent PEOPLE can't do in order to preserve them. When I was a little girl I didn't get to spend time with my father because he and my mother were divorced, but prior to the divorce he constantly kept us occupied on the lakes and streams in the area. Those are the best memories most young people share around this area. I took to the streams and have enjoyed sharing my love for them with friends from that point forward. I actively kayak them on a regular basis to this day and get everyone I know on them with me.

There are plenty of ways to reinforce taking care of them and as far as "Regulations" in order to do that, I as any responsible party am a willing participator and promoter of those Regulations. However, that being said, I am NOT in agreement with any " RESTRICTIONS " or taking away of freedoms that have to do with the Rivers, the way we use them or the Trails and they lack thereof and the way they are used. This land is the land that it has been for years, and it has been fine the way it is and continues to be just fine.

Plainly put there is NO reason to take away trails or the ability to use the river the way it has been used for years. If there are certain Regulations that can be put into place to preserve the Rivers and Trails in the area then those should be studied and then used accordingly. However, there is NO REASON for absolute control of these areas to be handed over to the NATIONAL GOVERNMENT.

Kimberly Raney

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2189	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 21:53:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to give feedback on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Alternative B seems like the best compromise for the protection of the land and water and allowing for uses by citizens. In general, I am concerned about the use of motorized boats, and also of motorized vehicles on the land. Motorized vehicles and horses are very hard on the streambanks and other sensitive areas, which need to be protected if we are to be able to share the beauty of natural Missouri with future generations. I was glad to see more opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2190	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 22:19:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our

citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2191    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 22:23:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
My comment is THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Doc Luke

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2192    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 22:31:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NO ACTION

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2193    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 23:23:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please take no action and continue the current management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2194    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:12:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The proposals limit recreational horse trails based on the fallacy that horses are bad for the environment. ATVs in the forest are worse for the environment. Horse back groups contribute more to the maintenance and clean up of trails than many other groups. The USFS is already trying to limit use of trails for horse back riders, citing lack of funds and the erosion they supposedly cause. Yet they won't accept volunteer labor for maintenance.

There is an attitude in the USFS (at least in the Ozarks) that the public is destructive and doesn't know how to take care of the forests. This is not correct-it is the USFS that has no idea how to take care of the forests. Many of the rangers don't even know the trails that they are responsible for and have to ask locals for information on them.

Limiting horse back riding to a smaller area and fewer trails is detrimental to those trails due to the higher use they will have. With the lack of maintenance, they become erosion-sensitive and often trenched. This is not only detrimental to the land, it is also detrimental to the horses and hikers. Many of the designated trails do not even meet the standards of the Trail Management Plan, while undesignated trails exceed them. Those trails are often old roadways that have better footing and are wider, which decreases the sensitivity to erosion.

Caving in to pressure from environmental groups is unjustified and unjustifiable. They do not believe that anyone "loves the forest as much as we do" and arrogantly try to demand restrictions and limitations. They are about as wrong as they can get! They aren't out here picking up the trash along the trails, or trying to repair an eroded piece of trail.

Please do not make any changes that limit or restrict trails for horse back use. If anything, start designating more trails to take the pressure off those commonly used.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2195    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and

enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2196	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 04:39:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support your proposal "B". It provides a sensible balance of the varying and sometimes conflicting interests of the park users.				

---

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2197	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 05:44:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I've been visiting ONSR for forty plus years				

---

I'd like to register my preference for plan B

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2198	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 06:00:54				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	No Action.				

---

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2199	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 07:18:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support Alternatives A or B				

---

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2200	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 07:21:54				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---



**Correspondence:** On behalf of the Board of Directors and the membership of Ozark Greenways Inc., I wish to acknowledge the efforts of the National Park Service for their openness and initiative in reviewing the current conditions within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. A review and course change in the present General Management Plan is long overdue.

Having reviewed the options put fourth it is our conclusion that actions within the proposed "Plan B" would appear to best serve the rivers and their resources at this time. Plan-B appears to strike a balance for most the present concerns raised.

We however encourage the National Park Service to continue their programs of environmental and stewardship education within the Riverways. Additionally we encourage the National Park Service to continue pursuing the original intent of the ONSR of protecting the resources as an opportunity to explore, participate in and experience a true wilderness environment thus gaining appreciation or our country's natural resources.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2201    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 07:37:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please protect the Ozark waterways from erosion and pollution by limiting the use of off-road vehicles in and near the streams. In addition to erosion and water pollution, they also create noise pollution which disturbs those who kayak, canoe and fish the streams.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2202    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 07:44:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No Action

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2203    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 07:45:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the proposed changes and believe the No-Action Plan is the best for the local economy. Tourism as it relates to these rivers, floating and fishing, have been a major source of income for the local economy since long before the Park Service has managed portions of the riverways. These rivers are cherished and cared for by our communities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2204    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 07:46:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would encourage NPS to consider option B on this. I feel it strikes the best balance for the constiteuncies involved.

Thanks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2205    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 07:47:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the proposed changes and believe the No-Action Plan is the best for the local economy. Tourism as it relates to these rivers, floating and fishing, have been a major source of income for the local economy since long before the Park Service has managed portions of the riverways. These rivers are cherished and cared for by our communities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2206    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 07:56:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to make a comment regarding the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I have been an environmental science educator for 30 years and a paddler of the Ozarks for nearly 40 years, so I've observed changes in the Park. The number one goal of any management plan should be resource protection; this does not seem to be the case with illegal ATV use, the huge growth in equestrian use along the river corridor (especially near Eminence), and the number of illegal vehicle accesses along the river. I'm aware that the NPS is not getting the resources it needs to address these problems. I think Plan B is the best plan for the future of the Park as it attempts to balance all users concerns and addresses protection of the natural resources. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2207 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 08:00:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please consider choosing option B. This is a wonderful area, and needs to be protected. If the jet boats need water, they should go to the lakes that were made for power boat recreation. Or they could stay on rivers big enough to handle barge traffic, such as the Mississippi or the Missouri Rivers. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2208 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 08:08:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** These rivers and the lands adjoining have been cherished and cared for since the first settlers came to the Ozarks. The rivers were pristine before NPS started acquiring and managing lands surrounding the rivers. The residents depend on these resources for a major part of the local economy and for that reason I believe the NO-ACTION PLAN is appropriate.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2209 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 08:08:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** On Behalf of the Board of Directors and the membership of the James River Basin Partnership, I commend the efforts of the National Park Service in providing a transparent and open review of the proposed changes in the General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverway. This update is needed to insure National Park Service protection of this invaluable resource now and in the future.

After review of the proposed plan options we recommend the NPS implement Plan "B". Plan "B" provides a compromise approach to management of the park and offers a balanced approach to constituent concerns.

We do however, encourage the National Park Service to commit the personnel and funds needed to fully implement the revised plan. This will insure that this national treasure is available for this and future generations.

Respectfully,

Joe Pitts  
Executive Director  
James River Basin Partnership

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2210 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 08:28:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I hope that you continue to create and retain trails for horses and riders. Diversified trails allowing many riders to ride without running into each other and providing water access.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2211 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 08:38:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the National Park Service's thoughtful analysis. Adopting Alternative B, as NPS recommends, would be a big positive step forward from the status quo. Nevertheless I believe Alternative B does not go far enough. After all this is a part of our National Park system and should be managed in the same nearly-pristine condition as our other National Parks. Bowing to pressure from locals because they have traditionally abused the river is not a NPS standard, nor in the interest of visitors. I recommend the adoption of Alternative A as it provides additional protections for the rivers. Of most importance, Alternative A to close illegal roads and restore natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads; Close 65 miles of non-designated horse trails and add no new stream crossings; and disallowing vehicle access to gravel bars. I also recommend wilderness status designation for Big Spring.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2212    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 08:57:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cultural and natural landscapes: As per the 1964 enabling legislation, Park Management is mandated to preserve, protect and manage the natural and cultural resources to the existing mid-1960's appearance and conditions. The Park should make it a priority to better maintain the historical structures, old farmsteads, scenic viewpoints and overall viewsheds. In the 1980's, the Park (for a few years) had an "Open Fields Management Plan" where fields were brushhogged, disced and native grasses sown. With prescribed burning and mechanical means, the traditionally open fields could be returned to the condition and appearance mandated in the legislation.

Roads: All Park roads, traces and accesses, whether Park-owned, county-owned or public roads, should remain open and unimpeded for all park visitor usage. This should include both motorized and non-motorized use. All secondary (non-paved gravel) roads should be maintained on a regular basis with a minimum once-per-year grading of cemetery roads, traditionally prior to Memorial Day each year. With adequate (two-wheel drive) road access, families and cemetery associations will continue to maintain the graves and cemetery grounds. When access roads are not maintained to minimum (regular grading and brush removal) standards, deteriorated conditions severely affects elderly and physically limited visitors from driving to fishing/swimming holes, hunting areas, former family farms and/or other recreation uses.

Trails: Current hiking and horse trails should remain in present locations with more emphasis by NPS and trail users on maintaining trail surfaces and erosion control. The Park should foster better relations with trail users (cooperative maintenance) and involve all users in any future planning processes. All current and traditional river crossings should remain as presently being used.

Outboard Motors: Current regulations and motor size restrictions are presently more stringent than necessary. River depth and natural obstructions have always been the self-limiting factors as to motorized watercraft. Recommend no change to present.

Cultural Interpretive Demonstrations: In addition to current cultural demonstrations, the Park should strive to re-implement the previous demonstrations of whisky making, blacksmithing and sorghum making. These traditional native activities were extremely popular with the visiting public and very educational for area school groups.

â€

Water Quality: Park management should be more pro-active in preventing the loss of streambanks, especially in developed areas of the Park. Large amounts of taxpayer monies have been invested in facilities within the river floodplain. One example (there are many) is the loss of streambank and campsites at the Alley Springs campground, due to neglect and lack of streambank stabilization. No doubt, one medium (4 to 8 foot rise) flood event per year (usually several) causes more erosion and river sedimentation than all public uses combined, each year.

Economic Impact: A very important point to consider by NPS in the planning process is the significant negative impact that Alternatives A, B and C will have on the local 6 county area. With tourism being the largest economic contributor in this area (especially Carter and Shannon counties), businesses will suffer and many jobs lost. This geographic area where ONSR is located is considered the most depressed economic area of Missouri, more jobs need to be created, not lost. Park Management needs to, through better relations and cooperation with congressional delegations, obtain an increase in base funding to better maintain Park assets and provide better quality visitor services.

I strongly favor the "No Action Alternative" to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2213 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 09:03:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the No Change Option.

It is good to, once every 20 years, review our park plans to see if our plan is working. I believe what we need is greater diligence in enforcement and education concerning the existing regulations and expectations of behavior from our visitors. Your report states that overall usage of the river is about the same, that 60/40 outboard motors are legal where they now run. I see no need for new regulations or changes in the current plan. However, based on concerns voiced by the public, I see a great need for enforcement of existing fishing regulations on the Current and Jacks Fork rivers. Canoeists need to be educated about where to canoe if they want peace and quiet. People need to be educated about how to safely share these waterways whether they are in a motorized vessel or not. Each needs to respect the maneuvering limitations of the other. Most importantly, these public, recreational waterways must be a place where we can bring our children without fear of them being emotionally assaulted by drunkenness and leud behavior. These are all issues of enforcement and education and do not require new regulations.

I support the No Change Option.

Respectfully submitted by Laura Wemhoener

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2214 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 09:07:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The protection of our rivers is extremely important. The plan that is proposed is well-balanced and should be implemented as soon as possible. We have to preserve our state's lands and waterways for future generations and be the best stewards possible to this wonderful natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2215 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 09:08:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm very concerned with the management plan they are proposing to do with Current River. My Family and I have enjoyed the river for over 15 years and I can't stand the thought of that being taking away from us. I know you think and taking away the boats is going to be the best thing for the river but, I can't/won't do tubes for my kids and I because they scare me they are so dangerous with all the root wades, snakes, and all the drama that comes with floating it very unsafe. My husband and I were boating last summer and had to rescue a lady that was floating and got stuck in the root wade (over turned tree in the river) that was so big if we wouldn't have hopped out of our boat to save her she probably would not be here today there was no way she would have been able to get out alone. My children love to go on the river and go for boat ride and there is no way a family of four with coolers and all of our gear you need for boating that a 40 horse power motor would be able to get over the shoals and the shallow areas. I know that the environmentalist think that it will be ok it the best thing to do but, they must not know the river and how is works or they would not be proposing this idea. I would like to know that the people proposing this idea truly have been on this river enjoying the river with their family and not just people with nothing to do/ angry land owners that don't like to noise of the boats, but people that actually Love the river as much as the people that live in the area.

Another area of concern about this proposal is how the economy would fall apart in all the small towns surrounding the river I know between Ellington and all the way to Arkansas along the river there is so much revenue that comes from everything from gas, charcoal, tube rentals, food, ice, ect. the list is end less I know for a fact the bigger boat motors take a lot more fuel than a truck or a small motor we boat 20-25 weekends a year and we spend 200-300 dollars every weekend Just on Fuel that's A lot of revenue/ taxes that are getting funded and that's only One Family could you really imagine what's going to happen when you take ALL of that AWAY. I sure hope whoever is proposing this General Management Plan is Prepared and knows ALL the facts!!!! Please Don't take the wholesome fun that me and my family so desire after a long week WE Truly LOVE the River and we don't want to have that taken from us!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2216 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 09:15:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I was informed of your plan via the internet.

Since I live far from any city and have a mega-slow connection, I am unable to bring up your 10MB 534 pages.

All I want to say is that I hope, if you must allow gas-powered motors in this hallowed watershed, that you limit them to 10 Hp....and perhaps outlaw them altogether in the future.

I would be Ok with silent battery-powered motors on a small scale.

The inspirational scenic riverways experience is all about everything BUT the sound and smell of man-made gas-burning engines.

Also I'd think you could better spend your money on the park any other way than paying salaries of enforcement officials spending the day and our tax money hiding in the bushes looking for cannabis smokers. Really.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2217 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 09:22:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In reference to the General Management Plan, especially the horse trails issue, I hope the planning and development of the designated trail system will take into consideration the need of multiple trails going to the different sights and scenes contained within the park's boundaries. A major part of the equestrian experience is to be a part of the beauty and serenity of nature and not be crammed into single file lines like subways and grocery store lines. Please consider the need of several trails to make the experience more enjoyable and to make conflict less likely. Also, the impact of fewer horses on several trails will be less than all the horses on a single trail. No one wants to travel hundreds of miles to ride a white chat hard tread trail. We can stay at home and ride the roads and have that experience. To be able to have access to the river is also a big part of the Scenic Riverways experience. To put the designated trails up and away from the river defeats the whole purpose of traveling to the park in the first place. Besides, the horses need to be watered and crossing the river to reach destinations is part of the fun. There are many horse riding groups that are anxious to help maintain and keep horse trails open and the more trails available the merrier.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2218 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 09:26:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The proposed plan to eliminate the boat motor from the upper parts of the Current River is unnecessary and overkill. The conflict between boat operators and canoeists on the upper part of the river isn't such to justify eliminating the use of motorized boating. The horsepower restrictions already in place restrict the use of the oversized motors and the size and depth of the river itself prevents the big boats with their big motors from the upper part of the river anyway. As I get older, I don't savor the idea of trying to stay upright in a canoe, much less paddling the distance between pickup points. A leisurely ride in a john boat is a much better way to enjoy the sights along the river including the upper part. Please drop the option of eliminating all motors from the upper Current.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2219 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 09:31:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the no action plan. We should not restrict access anymore than it currently is. These water ways are an important part of Missouri's economy. I fear further restrictions will negatively effect that. I also feel all Missourians should have unrestricted access to our States water ways. What we need IMO is better enforcement of our current laws and regulations. Not more laws and regulations! I respect your concerns for the well being of our natural resources. I worry about them too and often wonder if others will enjoy them as I have in the future. I see the abuse by others, the trash and damage done by vehicles, etc... It concerns me greatly in terms of preservation. However again restricting access is not the answer to these issues. The answer lies in better law enforcement of current laws and regulation. Not in restricting access to the public from what I believe is rightfully theirs to access at free will. No one IMO should be able to tell others where they can swim, camp, float, fish, etc...

on Missouri's rivers. We should however oversee these things and enforce any laws pertaining to them such as littering, dumping, glass containers, etc... Again more law enforcement is what we need!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2220    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 09:52:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly favor the "No Action Alternative" to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan and list several reasons and impacts below:

**Cultural and natural landscapes:** The 1964 enabling legislation for OZAR mandated and stipulated that the natural and cultural resources should be preserved, protected and managed to the existing mid-1960's appearance and conditions FOR the enjoyment of the public. The Park should make it a priority to better maintain the historical structures, old farmsteads, scenic and overall views. For several years during the 1980's, the Park had an "Open Fields Management Plan" where fields were brushhogged, disced and native grasses sown. With prescribed burning and mechanical means, the traditionally open fields could be returned to the condition and appearance mandated in the legislation. This would mitigate many negative effects done by annual river flooding as well. OZAR management has allowed overgrowth at Alley campground, historic swimming areas, picnic areas, and Alley Mill vista that do not comply with historic views and that limit visitor access and enjoyment. Tree and vegetation overgrowth has also adversely impacted visitor access at Big Spring and Round Spring developed areas within OZAR.

**Roads:** All roads, traces and accesses within OZAR should open for all park visitor usage. This should include both motorized and non-motorized use. All non-paved gravel roads should be maintained on a regular basis to allow unimpeded motorized and foot access to cemeteries, historic homesteads, fishing/swimming areas, and off-park hunting areas. OZAR was not designated as a wilderness area and there should be no efforts to change that.

**Trails:** The Park should foster better relations through cooperative maintenance with hiking and horse trail users and involve all users in any future planning processes. All current and traditional river crossings should remain open and accessible for visitor use.

**Outboard Motors:** Current regulations and motor size restrictions are presently more stringent than necessary. River depth and natural obstructions have always been the self-limiting factors as to motorized watercraft. Recommend no change to present.

**Cultural Interpretive Demonstrations:** In addition to current cultural demonstrations, the Park should strive to restore the previous extremely popular and educational native interpretive demonstrations of quilting, whiskey making, blacksmithing and sorghum making.

**Water Quality:** Park management should be more pro-active stream bank stabilization to prevent erosion and maintain pristine water quality, especially in developed areas of the Park. Large amounts of taxpayer monies have been invested in facilities within the Current and Jacks Fork rivers' floodplains. One example among many is the loss of stream bank and campsites at the Alley Springs campground, due to neglect and lack of stream bank stabilization. No doubt one medium flood event per year, and there are normally several of varying magnitudes, causes more erosion and river sedimentation than all public uses combined each year. Erosion sediment and silt have adverse effects on the wildlife in and adjacent to the rivers and contribute to negative changes in the rivers' courses.

**Economic Impact:** A very important point to consider by NPS in the planning process is the significant negative financial impact that Alternatives A, B and C will have on the local 6 county area. With tourism being the largest economic contributor in this area, specifically Carter and Shannon counties, businesses and families will suffer from loss of income and jobs. This geographic area where ONSR is located is considered the most economically depressed in Missouri. More jobs need to be created, not lost. Park Management needs to, through better relations and cooperation with congressional delegations, obtain an increase in base funding to better maintain Park assets and provide better quality visitor services.

OZAR park management must listen to and heed local residents and visitors for these individuals have the most to gain or lose by NPS decisions. External input is too often based on hearsay or quasi-environmental groups' agendas which have no basis in actual local knowledge or usage.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2221    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 09:57:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Take into consideration the unemployment rate in these areas and that these good country folk just as myself need the fish and game from these rivers and surrounding areas to subsidize the meat from the stores that they can no longer afford to purchase. All too often we forget that not all fishing and gigging, as well as hunting, is done for sport only. It's not always about relaxing and family outings sometimes it is all about putting food on the table to feed your family. How ironic is it that for many generations we have passed down such "knowledge nuggets" as "give a man a fish you feed him for today, teach a man to fish you feed him and his for life". Unless you close the fishing holes! Don't do that.  
SLW

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2222    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 09:57:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**  
Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams, springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

-Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.

-The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

-Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for generations to come.

Thank you for weighing in and caring about the future of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Please let your friends know that this national park needs their help.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2223    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 10:00:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Having read only the four possible management options (not the entire document), I would like to see a combination of Alternatives A and B(NPS preferred) adopted. My family and I have had the pleasure and privilege of visiting many national parks, which entails following rules and regulations to protect the park and ensure the safety of all visitors. The status quo is not acceptable for the Ozark National Scenic Riverway. Policy and management changes are needed.

While attending Wash U and for some years thereafter during the 1970's, I had the pleasure of spending countless hours floating Missouri's exceptional Ozark waterways in my spare time. As life's busy-ness took over, I had to abandon such blissful recreation for a number of years. When I was able to return - this time with my young twin sons in the mid-80's - the culture had changed measurably: large, noisy crowds of canoeists toting inner-tube shrouded coolers of beer were often clogging the way, monopolizing sand bars and typically leaving trash along the banks and in the river. In response, my family and I basically quit floating Missouri's streams - Current, Eleven Point, Jack's Fork, Huzzah, etc.

My suggestion would be to ban the use of alcohol and guns on the rivers. Enforcement will be costly; opposition to such bans will be loud and strong. As seen from the recent attempts to monopolize the parking lots at Powder Valley with trailered boats towed by pickups, opposition may be over the top in attempts to prevent changes to the unacceptable, unsustainable and unsafe status quo. Problems include: users on ATVs and horses polluting the water and disturbing the nests of fish and amphibians, and the fear of encountering property-owners or other canoeists carrying guns, but I see the primary problem as being the over-consumption of alcohol by users, which seems to have become ingrained in the floating culture.

Our NPS natural waterways are also local Missouri treasures, that should and must be preserved for environmental and legacy reasons. They must be protected from being "loved to death". In addition, we must take steps to ensure the safety of all users, particularly families with children. Individuals who live in the area likely derive a decent living from recreational opportunities along these waterways. That must be taken into account. However, in no way does it entitle them to dictate policy solely for their own enrichment.

I'd love to feel comfortable and safe enough to get back into a canoe down there again. I really miss it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2224    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 10:14:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the "No Action Alternative"

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2225    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 10:19:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I maintain a residence in Shannon County near the Upper Current River. I recreate on the river more than 100 days a year. I have seen many changes to river use over the past 30 years but ONSR management, for the most part, has tried to maintain the values and high standards expected of a national park.

I prefer Alternative B. Its focus on education and traditional recreation is a good fit for ONSR. There is a rich cultural tradition to be shared with visitors to the Riverways but it is often lost in overcrowding and commercialism.

To enhance educational and cultural opportunities, I encourage greater emphasis on nature and historic interpretation, preservation of historic structures and an investment in personnel to conduct these activities. (I also suggest that the lodge at Welch Spring either be finished or demolished, as it is an eyesore in its current condition.)

I support closure of illegally developed roads and trails. Vehicles can access the river almost everywhere, detracting from the scenic nature of the river and degrading the riparian corridor. Closure should be enforced and the landscape returned to its natural condition.

I support limiting gravel bar camping to walk-in or boat-in. Motor vehicles should be banned from gravel bars.



Horseback riding is causing severe erosion in areas such as Flying W on the Upper Current. Horseback riders should be required to stay on designated trails, and the trails should be monitored and re-routed when necessary to avoid erosion. Commercial horse operations should be regulated like canoe operations to limit overuse.

Erosion at Flying W needs to be addressed. Gravel was brought in three years ago, presumably to fix the ruts and harden the access to prevent further damage. The gravel still sits in a pile.

It is of utmost importance to monitor the fish, flora and fauna of ONSR. I support investing in positions such as water quality experts, biologists and archaeologists who can use their expertise to ensure the riverways are not irreparably damaged by development and overuse.

In the past few years, new rules and stepped-up enforcement regarding floaters' behavior on the river have vastly improved safety and visitor experiences at ONSR. Please allocate sufficient resources to continue enforcement.

Finally, I support the National Park Service's role in resource protection in the face of local political opposition. We depend on the NPS to resist calls for more development and unregulated use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2226    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 10:22:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly support increasing restrictions on horse use of the river valleys, especially crossings, and ORV use must be restricted to certain trails with penalties for mis-use (confiscation?) . perhaps also concessioners should be limited to some certain maximum outings per day in heavy use season to avoid the river looking and acting like a mob scene.

NPS is doing a pretty good job at managing the river otherwise.

make sure it stays pretty and clean as can be.

tom moran

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2227    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 10:24:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to thank everyone involved with the very hard work it had to take to put these studies and plans together. These areas are an incredible natural resource. As a frequent visitor of these areas I see a definite need to reduce human impact as it relates to motorized anything. If you have ever floated down any of these rivers and had a john boat with a 150 hp jet fly by you going up river you will know what I am talking about ( DEA and MO dept of Conservation are some of the boats)

More managed trails, and increased facilities to handle the crowds during the peak season. I like alternate B. I think it's a good start. I feel more could be done, but it's impossible to please everyone, and this plan gets the ball rolling.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2228    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 10:27:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a year round paddler of kayaks and canoes, I've paddled above the Arctic Circle in Alaska, on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, on the waters of the Great Lakes and on many rivers and lakes across the country. I know of no river system more beautiful and unique than the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I was introduced to it over 60 years ago as a youngster and it has made an indelible impression on me and my love for the outdoors.

As a paddler I'm interested in maintaining the very best paddling experience, outdoor experience, and river camping experience possible. I also recognize the rich land based recreation and cultural heritage this area has to offer to anyone interested in the outdoors and, in particular, this region.

I believe that, if properly implemented, Alternative B can best provide all of the above and at the same time provide an economic boost to the region.

Above all other actions, the abuse, degradation, and overuse of the riverways must be stopped. This includes

- \* removing ATV and other motorized traffic from all gravel bars and undesignated access areas,
- \* restricting horse traffic to designated trails and river crossings,
- \* restricting high performance power boat usage,
- \* and managing the sheer number of people that concessionaires place in the same sections of the river for recreation.

I commend the efforts of the National Park Service in creating this plan and look forward to its implementation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2229    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 10:35:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing as an individual citizen who has enjoyed the many benefits of the ONSR with my friends and family since visiting them as a child the year after the park was established. I enjoy camping, hiking, fishing, hunting, wildlife viewing, scenic driving, visiting historical sites, and especially canoeing and river camping on the two magnificent rivers that make up the core of the area. I have visited the ONSR scores, if not hundreds of times over the last fifty years.

I favor alternative B as my first choice because it strikes a good balance between local recreational interests and the broader state and national public and it still aims at protecting those qualities and resources that make this area so special. I would also approve alternative A if that is the direction that is finally selected, since that alternative is best in line with my personal views on how the Riverways should be managed. I strongly oppose alternative C, which takes us further away from the very qualities that make this area a national treasure.

One specific point that I would like clarified in the final document is that all gravel bars should remain open to camping for those accessing them from the river itself, or on foot via a trail. This is not made clear in the document. I am in favor of restricting vehicular access to specific gravel bars.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Rick Thom  
Jefferson City, MO

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2230    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 10:38:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The closing of gravel bars that have been traditional camping areas, just to hide vehicles and trailers from the eyes of passing floaters, is absurd and arrogant. These areas have been used by the local population and tourist long before the park existed and the use should be promoted not restricted. Mostly these are people who live in the area that have been using the gravel bars such as "The Log Yard" for generations. Closing the gravel bars for the sensitivity of a few people is abhorrent and the closures should not be permitted.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2231    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 10:54:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Closing of any trails that cross the park was not the intention of the original National Scenic Riverways Easement Plan. Horse trails, ATV trails, and hiking trails can and should coexist together. Leave we the people who use these trails alone! All the horror stories of erosion, littering, and environmental damage are trumped up and not validated by proper research. The Park Service should enhance the trail systems and invite more use, instead of reducing and closing trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2232    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks

Fork Riverâ€s free-flowing streamsâ€springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected in the presence of a growing desire for outdoor recreation.

I support the following:

- Slight changes and strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal or year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative B.
- The 60/40 horsepower limit now in use on portions of the riverways is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and I support the Park Service proposed rule-making to make these motors legal so that recreational boaters can continue to enjoy the riverways.
- To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative B adding 35 miles of designated horse trails, closing and restoring 65 miles of undesignated trails and unauthorized river crossings, and improving a 23-mile-long trail system to avoid sensitive areas.
- The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.
- Finally, many of the provisions in the General Management Plan will require additional staffing at the park. I strongly urge the National Park Service to make this a priority so that regulations that have been ignored for 30 years can be enforced, or simply put, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will not survive for future generations.

National parks are economic generators for local communities and the Riverways is no exception. The more than 1 million visitors each year spend about \$55.5 million. This national park is responsible for creating 845 jobs, representing 16 percent of the total employment of the local area. The balanced approach in Alternative B provides opportunity for growth in small business, especially for new concessioners and outfitters, and a well-managed park will continue to attract visitors for

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2233    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 10:59:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Ozark National Scenic Riverways  
404 Watercress Dr.  
P.O. Box 490  
Van Buren, MO 63965

RE: Comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan

Dear Superintendent Black:

It is distressing that it is necessary for me to provide comment on actions and events that should have never been allowed to occur to begin with. The Mission of the Riverways is to provide conservation, preservation and recreation of the resource in that order. I have written in the past regarding what I consider to be lax administration of the Riverways and the accompanying environmental degradation. In addition, the recreational experience has been affected by horses and powerboats to the degree where I no longer take my children to the Riverways.

I am certain that the local public outcry that there should be any kind of regulation of this public resource is uncomfortable. That park administration officials and parties interested in restoring the Riverways should be vilified in meetings by belligerent locals and opportunist politicians as has been reported by conservation organizations is unfortunate. As a national resource, it is also unfortunate that public meeting of the GMP review were limited to the local area and St. Louis; thus depriving those outside Southeast Missouri with the opportunity to contribute to the review.

My first canoe trip was on the Current River at Round Spring in the early 1960s. I was mesmerized by the experience and returned many times. Canoeing became a lifelong pursuit with family members currently owning 9

canoes and six kayaks. When my son was about 13, he was nearly run down by a powerboat above Two Rivers. As we were in a large group of boats, this had to be deliberate. Subsequently, we only paddled the upper reaches of the Current above Pulltite. On a more recent adult trip from Round Spring to Two Rivers, our party was threatened by wild horses and our campsite at Bee Bluff was made nearly unbearable by the constant drone of jet pump boats at full throttle. Nearly every gravel bar had an unattended camping trailer parked nearby (during the week before Memorial Day).

It is for these reasons that I favor Option A to return the Riverways to a state closer to that I believe was intended in the enabling legislation. No individual should be allowed convert a public resource for their private exclusive use. Unauthorized roads should be eliminated and park boundaries identified and secured. As budget cuts are a reality, these activities should take precedence over capital expenditures for Park Visitor Centers (Powder Mill was bad idea 40 years ago) or other additional development.

When I first commented on the upcoming revisions to the GMP several years ago, I read a compilation of the public input online. While there were some well-reasoned comments, there were many more "cut and paste" entries opposed to any regulation from narrow interests...particularly horse and off-road vehicle groups. I would urge that identical comments be considered as a single comment for purposes of evaluating public input. Those who lack sufficient knowledge of the issue to make an independent comment should not receive the same consideration of those who do.

Failing to take action on the GMP would be as negligent as the previous management that allowed these abuses to occur. In addition, failing to take action would be a violation of environmental law and the Park Service's own policies and procedures.

I am not without concern for the impacts of implementation on local landowners, businesses and other individuals. One source has stated that 88% of the dollars spent in and around the Riverways come from outside the area. Local claims of economic ruin if the locals aren't allowed to do exactly as they please would not seem to be in the interest of the local economy if former regular visitors fail to return as I have elected to do.

I urge you as Superintendant, and the National Park Service to restore the beautiful rivers I visited in my youth and provide a safe and environmentally sound resource for my children and grandchildren.

Sincerely,

Martin Burke  
Lawrence, Kansas

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2234    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 11:04:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No Action!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2235    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 11:05:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello my name is Max Ball and I live within minutes of this river and own land within feet of its banks. I strongly support the no action alternative. Why? Because I care about this river and land and its well being. I happen to have firsthand experience of growing up on this river and knowing every bend, hole, shoal, hollow, ridge and trail on this land. I don not understand why more restriction is being pushed so hard when the restrictions we currently have are not properly enforced. Why not start with enforcement of the current regulations and see how big of an impact that makes? Further restriction will do nothing at all to this river and land. Furthermore where is the empirical data other than from a biased ill informed source from a city with no firsthand experience showing that the way we currently use this river and land is detrimental to its ecological being? Leave the river, land, and its people alone and let it remain the beautiful natural area that it currently is.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2236    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 11:06:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The National Park Service has warped the initial intent of the "National Scenic Riverways Scenic Easement". The original intent was guaranty public access to the Jacks Fork and Current rivers. Instead of guarantying access, the National Park Service has been aggressively closing access to the Easement over the last four decades. Due to this mismanagement of the people of Missouri's intent, the National Park Service should return the National Scenic Riverways to the State of Missouri.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2237 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 11:07:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Leave the regulations for the Park as they currently are. Make no changes!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2238 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 11:12:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I first started visiting the ONSR about 40 years.

Some the best days of my life were spent floating the ONSR enjoying the wildlife and the peace of nature.

Some of the worst days of my life were also spent on the ONSR while enduring noise from ATVs, boats, and trucks on gravel bars. On our last trip our gravel bar campsite had to be cleared of piles of horse manure and litter before we could begin preparing our meal.

The most important actions you can take are eliminating unauthorized access roads and gasoline powered motorboats. (Electric motors for fishing are OK.) However, increased enforcement is the key to getting results.

I support Alternative B.

David Bedan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2239 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 11:13:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Comments on the ONSR Draft General Management Plan/Wilderness Study/EIS

River-based recreation:

Access points: Relocation of existing accesses is good. Less than 20 is preferable.

Motorized Boating: How about 25 HP max from Round Spring to Southern Big Spring instead of 60/40?...

Also, how about no HP at all on the Jacks Fork from the Western boundary to West Eminence?... Remember that any motorized travel on the Jacks would be difficult and very disruptive/destructive to a sensitive Ozark aquatic system!

Land-based recreation:

Hiking trails: Any road conversions to hiking trails is good. Any additional trail construction is good.

Access via hiking trail to gravel bar camping in remote areas anywhere along the riverways would be a welcome addition to existing amenities. (Contact me for particular suggestions!)

Mountain biking in non-primitive zones is good.

Horse trails: Closure of undesignated horse trails is good.

Creation of new river crossings is not good and should be avoided. Tributary horse stream crossings would be acceptable.

Note - There are thousand of acres of public lands nearby the Riverways available for equestrian usage where damage would not be as significant.

River access: Please consider no additional development along the upper Jacks Fork above Rymers. The mean peak-season discharge is only 143 cfs (for Jun-Aug 1993-2013 at Alley Springs, per USGS). For comparison, the mean peak-season discharge for Current River at Van Buren is 1500 cfs, or 10 times more water flow...

Gravel bar camping via foot or boat is good, having relatively minimum negative impact.

Wilderness: The Alternative B wilderness proposal is good and important.

Final Note: By congressional action the ONSR is a national park, a small piece of which belongs to all Americans. The above comments do not undermine the rights of local citizens, of which I am one(residing in nearby Ripley County). It is my strong suspicion that a lightly modified Alternative B plan implementation would provide for greater economic opportunities for local businesses and residents.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2240    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 11:34:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Missouri really needs to protect its great rivers. We are a huge (maybe the biggest) rivers, springs and caves state. (Most Missourians possibly don't know that). Except for Lake Superior, we might have some of the cleanest clearest water in the country, except for all the horses and ATV's that cross and contaminate them - as well as all the canoe/raft floaters (which is great if they behave themselves and protect the rivers.) And, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is the best of all, surrounded by national forests and wilderness. We might have to supply other parts of the country with water some day with Lake Mead and even the Colorado River (Las Vegas, Nev., Arizona, New Mexico)drying up and the serious draught of southern California.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2241    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 11:45:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a horse loving person I would like to ask that you not close any horse trails. So many hard working people would be devastated! The small town of eminence mo and surrounding towns would be terribly effected by closing equine trails. These towns count on trail-riding, floaters, and hikers to make their living . So many people would lose. Horse lovers do take very good care not to harm any nature while riding. We are very conscious of preserving nature so that we may continue to use these beautiful trails all over Missouri . Please take into consideration that peoples lively hood comes from these small towns ! And that people will go other places to ride and that money they would spend will go to other towns . Horse people will not stop riding, they would just go elsewhere. The town of eminence would pay the price for closing trails. We all love the small towns and rivers and look forward to going to these places. Thanks!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2242    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 11:45:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I vehemently oppose the proposed management changes to the OSNR. I believe the changes will negatively impact small businesses in our area that rely heavily on tourism. It will also negatively impact the way in which the OSNR has been used and enjoyed by people in this area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2243    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 11:45:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** A cultural and visitor's center should in or near eminence maybe at the mdc office area, we are the heart of the ONSR with the largest concentration of park travelers. powder mill gets very few visitors and not be

a good place. Some of the locals and a lot of the trail rides have a take over type attitude when they go to the river here. Hold them accountable for their bogus behavior and do not let these type of people ruin it for the rest of us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2244    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 11:54:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the No Action Alternative. If it's not broke, don't fix it. There is no problem with the way that it's being ran now.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2245    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 12:00:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Regarding the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan, I strongly encourage choosing Alternative A, or at the very least, Alternative B.

The outlook on protecting this natural asset should be for the long term, as in decades and centuries. The pressures on this area are great at the present time, and over time, the pressures will only increase as natural areas diminish and population grows. Everyone in the area complaining about protecting this natural asset to the fullest degree will be long gone some day, and future generations will thank you for protecting this area for the long term to the fullest degree.

So please, when making your decision, THINK LONG TERM for what is best for this area, and remember that the complaints of too much conservation from a few is a short term issue.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Kevin Lowder  
Missourian

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2246    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 12:01:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No action is needed at this time. Any alternative plans that restrict or prohibit lands from being used by citizens or plans that are managed by unaccountable advisory committess or NGOs are not needed. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2247    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 12:02:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the plan that will most effectively protect the natural wonders of the Scenic Riverways. I am an avid user of the rivers, for canoeing and camping. I canoe yearly and yearly the group I canoe with spends a good portion of out time cleaning up the garbage left behind by careless people. We bring snorkling gear and actually dive for as much garbage as we can reasonably get to. I realize that the impact of a few beer cans is nothing compared to the damage done by the four wheelers, horse manure and the illegal dumping of harmful chemicals into the water. I can appreciate how the local population feels about the river, however, I feel that their ignorance is only hurting themselves and if they had their way the rivers would soon look no better than the dirt roads. I want to preserve the pristine quality of the water and the wild life.

I am unhappy to report that some years ago my friend discovered the remnants of a meth lab, near one of the drainage areas into Jam Up cave. He reported this to the authorities and it was cleaned up. I do not think that people living in this area are aware of the geohydrology of karst topography and how easily it could happen that all of the aquifers in this area could be contaminated. Everything goes somewhere as they say, and it would certainly not help the local economies if the water is so contaminated that no one can use it.

I urge you to pick the most protective plan, although I am sure that the local population will continue to misuse and abuse the rivers, but anything we can do to protect these treasures is of the utmost importance.

Thank you for your hard work in managing our national parks,

Juli von zur Muehlen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2248    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 12:03:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No action

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2249    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 12:06:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** February 6, 2014

RE: Comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways  
Draft General Management Plan (GMP)

Dear Superintendent:

I am writing to share my comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan (GMP). I prefer Alternative B as outlined in the Draft General Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement. Specifically, my Riverways experience includes extensive canoeing, camping, fishing, photography and hiking along both the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers for several decades. :

These uses are important to me because of the high quality opportunities to recreation and participate in nature while appreciating Missouri's heritage. :The primary areas I visit include the Jacks Fork from Highway 17 to Alley Springs and the Current River from the headwaters to Two Rivers.:

I value the ecosystem values of the Riverways area including opportunities to protect native hellbenders and restore elk to their original habitat.

The 'No Action' alternative is unacceptable to me because it fails to address the need for more enforcement of existing laws and standards, to better manage overcrowding, and to improve communication and partnership with local landowners and communities. Further, it fails to address these critical problems in the Riverways: The management of ONSR-in terms of resource preservation, sustainable use management, and restoration of natural ecosystems-should rival that of our nation's most pristine and unique public lands.

Yours truly,

Robert Roth  
18683 Joyce Ct.  
Oregon City OR 97045

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2250    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 12:06:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I will make this brief. The Missouri Rivers, namely, the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers have been a part of my family's natural heritage for nearly two centuries. By no means do we want interference or regulations on our right to use our waterways. We do enjoy swimming, camping, floating, and canoeing on the river ways tremendously. I have my own grandchildren with to share the rivers and they all relish it, as I have and do. The only thing wrong, that I can see, is that the NPS have involved themselves in the people of Missouri's recreation. It has brought tourists from everywhere. This isn't always a bad thing. But, there are too many tourists who do not care about the condition they leave the area, unlike the people that live here.

---



**Correspondence ID:** 2251 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 12:07:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think that Alternative B makes the most sense. Our waterways need to be protected!

In addition, I agree with the MO Coalition for the Environment's recommendations:

More hiking trails  
No horse campgrounds in the Riverways  
Minimal restrictions on motorized boats.  
Sensitive natural and cultural resource management that avoids new conversions of bottomland riparian forests to open fields, or artificial pasture for elk and other animals and focuses on restoration of upland meadows, woodlands, and glades with native vegetation.  
The restoration of impaired riverbanks that avoids developed facilities along the rivers, which are screened from view from the river in any case, and low impact.  
Prioritization of solutions for problem areas that focuses on low-impacts in riparian zones.

Thank you, Lisa

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2252 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 12:19:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thursday, February 6, 2014

Subject: I support healthy Ozark Riverways - - Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan/Wilderness Study/EIS

Dear Superintendent Bill Black and NPS Director Jonathon Jarvis,

I strongly support the National Park Service's Preferred Alternative B for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan, which provides for redistribution of uses to minimize conflict, restoration of degraded areas, and more staff for maintenance, monitoring, and enforcement, while substantially enhancing visitor experience of park resources.

"In permitting the sacrifice of anything that would be of the slightest value to future visitors to the convenience, bad taste, playfulness, carelessness, or wanton destructiveness of present visitors, we probably yield in each case the interest of uncounted millions to the selfishness of a few individuals."  
- - Frederick Law Olmstead

In the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, unauthorized roads, overuse by all-terrain vehicles, and excessive equestrian use in sensitive areas have contributed to degradation, including increased bank erosion, more sediment in the water, reduced habitat quality, and unsafe bacteria levels in certain river stretches.

"Every man who appreciates the majesty and beauty of the wilderness and of wild life, should strike hands with the farsighted men who wish to preserve our material resources, in the effort to keep our forests and our game beasts, game-birds, and game-fish- -indeed, all the living creatures of prairie and woodland and seashore- -from wanton destruction. Above all, we should realize that the effort toward this end is essentially a democratic movement."  
- - Theodore Roosevelt

Re-directing high impact activities to areas where damage is minimized, allowing damaged areas to heal, establishing levels of use that enable the rivers to maintain quality, and organizing activities with respect for the natural and cultural resources are the keys to stewardship of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

"A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise."  
- - Aldo Leopold

Please select the Preferred Alternative B for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan,

Thank you for your consideration of my comments. Please do NOT add my name to your mailing list. I will learn about future developments on this issue from other sources.

Sincerely,  
Christopher Lish  
Olema, CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2253    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 12:22:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No action.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2254    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 12:45:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

I am for Alternative A and hope that the National Park Service will be also. There are so many reasons why we need to protect our wild spaces and have a safe place for everyone to enjoy and spend time replenishing the important energy that only nature can offer. I often go to the national parks in order to have peace and solitude without the effects that machines and domesticated animals have. It is true that all people should be able to enjoy the space, but not to the detriment of others enjoyment, and to the destruction of the very space that we need to protect so that it will be there undisturbed for next time. I implore you to make sure that this wilderness is protected and stays in the most natural state as possible so that our society doesn't lose one of the most important sources of connection with nature. Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Lev Guter

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2255    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 12:49:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for putting together a thoughtful analysis on the various alternative plans for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I agree that adopting Alternative B would be a big positive step forward. However, I do not believe Alternative B goes far enough to protect the rivers, and therefore I urge NPS to adopt Alternative A. The benefits of Alternative A include closing illegal roads and restoring natural conditions to 50 miles of the roads, closing 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and adds no new stream crossings, barring vehicular access to gravel bars, and giving wilderness status designation for Big Spring.

I spent 4 years as an undergraduate trip leader for Washington University and know these sections of the Ozark Trail and Current River very well. Big Spring is one of my favorite places I have visited in my travels throughout the country, and I feel it should be treasured in a way that protects it from development and desecration. Further, I thoroughly enjoy the peace of mind that comes with hiking in nature, and I find it unfortunate that there have been many times my groups and I have been disrupted by ATVs on trail. When I come out to this area in groups ranging in size from 8 to 60 people, we always are careful to uphold principles of Leave No Trace. I hope that the NPS will help ensure that others will continue to treat these lands with such respect.

Thank you,

Maddy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2256    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 12:50:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whome It May Concern:

We have taken friends and students to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways areas for over 40 years through our canoeing experiences. This national treasure is something that equals any protected natural area in the world.

The monies we have spent on lodging, food, canoe rentals, buying things at local stores, and buying gasoline have contributed to jobs and the economy of the region. We have estimated that our groups of students and groups of friends have spent over \$1000 per year totalling \$40,000 over 4 decades. That is just one groups contributions to the economy. We know that some of the students are now taking their families and friends canoeing (a neighbor couple, former students taking groups of 10 each year) as well.

We have heard about the consideration to broaden the types of visitors to these areas. ATV, camping, and similar activities can do great harm to the beauty of the river through erosion, pollution, and ill treatment. We are strongly encouraging the Park Service to KEEP THE SAME DESIGNATION to protect these national treasures.

Jan and Lyle Alderson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2257 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 13:06:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I grew up in southwest Missouri, near Springfield; my wife grew up near Birch Tree. We began canoeing on the Jacks Fork in 1962, before the ONSR park was established. Although we have lived in Kentucky since 1969, we still get back periodically to the Riverways for canoe/camping trips. Since we never use a powerboat, our preference is to keep the Riverways as primitive as possible. We do appreciate concessionaires to rent canoes, to provide canoe put-ins and takeouts, and to provide camping supplies. If we were to cast a vote, it would be for Alternative A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2258 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 13:22:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please strongly consider every action that can be taken to reduce the amount of motorized vehicles from ruining the most pristine and natural area that our state has to offer. I have been fishing the Jack's Fork river for over 20 years and now taking my son and daughter there to bask in the beauty of what this beautiful place has to offer. We always support the local communities surrounding Alley Springs and want to continue enjoying this area for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2259 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 13:26:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I personally do not like the idea of losing anymore horseback riding trails. It is immaterial if we are supposed to gain other trails. It usually ends up that there are a lot less riding accessable trails in the end. Additionally the loss of access for emergency services does not sound like a good idea to me. In the backcountry, you need all the access you can get if something bad happens.

I understand that many people are upset over horse waste in the river. I get that, but what about when a large group of people are together in the river????

I have a feeling that there are many times more people in the river than there are horses.

Just my humble opinion.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2260 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 13:27:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** NO action should be taken on the management of the Ozark Scenic Riverways along the Current and Jacks Fork rivers. More legislation and more restrictions are not a proper alternative to current management and should not be considered. As usual, it appears the federal government has made plans to regulate from a distance without becoming locally connected. The aesthetic and ecological beauty of these waterways is without a doubt the best found any where in the country and it must be preserved, but it must be preserved by those who use the area and not by regulation which would limit or even restrict the availability of such a vital resource. I strongly support Jason Smith's stand on this issue.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2261 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 13:34:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Alternative A. This is based upon my study of the plan and my experience as a floater and camper of the upper Jack's Fork and Current Rivers for over forty years.

It is the unspoiled wilderness of these areas that brings me to these sections of the river. If you destroy this, you destroy the reason why many visitors come.

I believe that conservation of the resource is the best long-term policy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2262 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 13:37:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Establish and enforce a "seasonal only" motor boat ban on portions of the upper rivers. Boaters would still be able to trap and gig out of their boats (late fall and winter activities) and, because there are very few floaters or boaters during cold weather, conflicts between these user groups would be minimal.

Establish and enforce a "seasonal only" horse power limit south of Big Spring.

Establish and enforce parking limits at accesses and other parking areas.

Designate river use zones and establish and enforce river use limits by zone.

Establish designated campsites and parking areas at drive-in gravel bars and enforce existing regulations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2263 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 13:39:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I want to thank the National Park Service for a well done and thoughtful analysis in your Draft Management Plan. While Alternative B is a positive step in the right direction, I support the adoption of Alternative A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2264 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 13:40:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I sent this yesterday but have not received confirmation it was sent-Please reply so I do not send again

I have been enjoying the recreational uses of the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers for over 30 years. I camp, fish, ride horses and canoe. This is very important to me not only for my personal enjoyment but I've been taking my children with me for over 25 years and now my grandchildren. Both my grandchildren have been coming since they were under 4 months old. We have all learned much about nature, the culture of the area it has also helped with family bonding. I have floated the river, camped, and ridden horses on trails with my children and grandchildren for years. They have learned much to respect nature and we have all grown as a family because of this. My late husband loved the area so much he came back for his last trip there and even died, as he wished, in the area. We all went to bluegrass festivals and many local craft shows. We have made close friends with local people, most of whom welcome outsiders with open arms

It would be a shame if this were to change. It is very important to keep these areas open for people and their families to enjoy as they always have. I know so many people that count the days from one year to the next until they can come back. I happen to live in a rural area but there are so many people that visit this area that have no access to nature and it's very important that they continue to be able to get away to an area they can rest, relax, and renew their spirit.

As for taking care of the natural resources I'm sure there is a very small portion of the population that doesn't respect the natural resources but do not think there are enough people abusing the area for it to unnecessarily restrict the recreational areas. On this note I think the ONSR would be better served by the state, which has a better record of keeping up their areas, than the federal government which does not have its finger on the pulse of the community. Why would you want to restrict so much enjoyment? It's there for all of us to enjoy not just for the chosen few and the chosen places. I think the GMP is overstepping boundaries by trying to regulate policy and visitor standards, as well as limiting future decisions by local government and people. By doing this you are adversely disturbing their livelihoods and indeed their future. Please turn the ONSR over to the state and leave it alone for the public's future use and pleasure.

Chris Tigrett Fox  
Highway 77  
Newbern, Tennessee 38059  
731 676-0651

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2265    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 13:49:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent:  
I'm writing to share my comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan (GMP).

I prefer Alternative B as outlined in the Draft General Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement.

Specifically, my experience in the Riverways is in the following recreational uses:  
Canoeing the Upper Current and camping at Round Spring, as well as visiting/using all the springs accessible to the public along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers.

These uses are important to me because: I grew up in southern Missouri, and have been spending some parts of my summers on the Current my whole life. Connecting with the natural beauty of these areas AND the history is an important part of a cultural identity I want to pass on to my children.

In addition, I appreciate the conservation and preservation functions of the National Park because: When I floated the river with my dad as a child, there were areas covered with beer cans and diapers, and it was difficult to know what you'd find on the next gravel bar. There are other rivers in Missouri that have been treated this way, and desecrated really. I am grateful that designation of the ONSR has helped protect the length of both riverways.

Sincerely,  
Dana S. Lashly

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2266    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 13:54:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No Action

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2267    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 13:55:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS

I have carefully read the Draft Proposal and offer this as my comment:

First, I would like to address the document. It is an amazing example of double talk. The language is perhaps appropriate for a paper presented at a training seminar. The language is not appropriate for a public comment document. The ideas could be presented more clearly and accurately with clear, concise, non-technical language.

Second, I was struck by the various snippets of what appeared to be contradictions. For example, in a couple of places I noticed that the option compared was that "cemeteries would continue to be maintained" versus "approximately five additional cemeteries would be maintained". I guess it all comes down to the definition of "maintained". OZAR certainly does not currently, nor has it ever, attempted to provide helpful signage, maintained roads to family cemeteries within its boundaries, mowed, maintained or preserved headstones or enclosures around these locations. This language makes me sort of curious as to what the plan was for these five additional cemeteries for which presumably, using your definition, some maintenance has been on-going. But it sounds good!

Third, I noticed that for various subjects, one option would include studies as to the efficacy and need for a particular thing or activity while another option would impliedly assume that it was wanted, needed, and appropriate, e.g. mountain biking.

Fourth, I noticed various instances of standards being implemented (see page 95) or considered without any explanation of how OZAR came up with the data to support such numbers of no more than 6 within 50 feet, other than comments like "{T}he indicator for human impacts to cultural resources and sites is based on this existing monitoring protocol." I also found phrasing such as "the NPS approach to zoning has changed". We are not made privy to how and why such changes occurred nor how they might affect this matter.

Fifth, the proposal did not include any breakdown of the type of visitors who came to OZAR historically, currently or as anticipated, in terms of their reasons for coming. Specifically how many of the park visitors came to blow off steam on the river, how many came for that Muir experience in the woods and how many came to sit along the riverbank and watch the river go by from their camper. Many of the park visitors come to the park one time per year while many others come weekly. Are you planning for that one time per year visitor or the one visiting more frequently? Have you done any type of monitoring and by that I mean monitoring that has been tested and determined to be statistically accurate as a basis for the presumptions included here not a jumble of park registrations and other data that do not include visitor hours as opposed to visits? The reference is made to "traditional family oriented" experiences but what are you talking about. How many visitors consist of "traditional family units"?

Sixth, at some point, with each of these options, reference is made to the three and apparently only three options OZAR staff have been able to identify in terms of correction of whatever the problem might be, e.g. off road travel, whatever, as visitor education, increased enforcement or closure of that opportunity.

How does that work? Are you going to require each visitor to complete a visitor education module before being allowed out and about? Is closing these options meeting the park mandate? How do you get a law enforcement person where the action is every time there is a need, particularly as few as there are?

Many of us have gone through this planning process a number of times over the years. While planning is necessary and commendable, the bottom line for the planning process is that any plan given serious consideration must be feasible. There are a number of sub-elements to that concept but in summary form it must be capable of being done.

Your information indicates that as of 2011, 23 of the 80 FTE positions remained unfilled due to financial or budget constraints. Each of the options A, B, and C are more expensive than the "no action" option you indicate you are operating under now. Looking at the general economy how realistic is it that you would receive a boatload of funding? If you do not receive the funding for the entire option, which parts of the options are to be implemented,

how is that decided and what impact does that have on the overall plan? I submit that your preferred option and options A and C are not financially feasible and that therefore each is essentially a no option and a giving of an illusory option in that picking and choosing elements within a plan, is not adopting a specified plan.

In addition, you characterize the "no action" plan as a baseline while appearing to offer this as an option. You have an existing plan. What you have said is that that plan is "not always an accurate reflection of adaptive management approaches taken by NPS staff to address unforeseen or emerging issues". In clearer phrasing it might be said that you will comply with a General Management Plan so long as it is "appropriate" to do so.

Ultimately I believe that NO ACTION is the best and only choice.

When this park came into being we had broad open fields and pastures. Those open areas are, for the most part, overgrown by locust, multiflora rose and other noxious and impenetrable vegetation. Much of the land was fenced and people were not accustomed to traveling at will across fields or other such areas but remained in the roads or traces used for many years by their fathers and fathers' fathers.

The rivers had gravel bars but the landowners managed the river by maintaining a channel (not by channeling) but by keeping the river somewhat concentrated into a main channel and back sloughs. It was a light touch, not a hands off and not a channel everything.

The local communities were the starting point for visitors to the river who then were often directed to locations where information centers existed. When the Powder Mill area was purchased a visitor center was constructed with a plan to develop the Lesch place into a destination. Look at the amount of deterioration it has been allowed to suffer in the hands of NPS. Now you are suggesting moving out of the CCC buildings in one of your options. The next step of course we can see.

You have one of the best state conservation programs in the country. You appear to be unwilling to take advantage of the resources on hand to assist in making management decisions for bank stabilization, wildlife management and protection and land stewardship.

You have local entities both public and private willing and ABLE to provide knowledge and leadership having to do with roads, public contact, and other related disciplines, yet you have not met them with any degree of interest but you talk of a "friends" program.

Management of OZAR has in its grasp the plan it should be implementing, the current plan. You have not managed to do that yet. You have a top heavy agency. You do lots of research, you have no public contact in Eminence which is in the heart of the park. You have no interpretive method of supplying the results of your research to park visitors. You have a relay service through Buffalo which is not even known to most people who would have need of it. You use internet and information out of Van Buren for a park where finding a signal is pretty iffy at best. Your signage program is not helpful. You have too few law enforcement and too little overall support of law enforcement because it is not used as a deterrent nor as a learning tool.

You have the tools, you have the resources. Use the tools to manage, protect, and interpret the resources. If one use is intrusive, limit it for that specific event or locale. Manage the park pursuant to the implementing legislation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2268    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 14:14:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support implementation of alternatives A or B when it comes to future management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

The proliferation of unauthorized river accesses not only compromises the quality experience of park visitors, it threatens the persistence of native species. Illegal collection for the pet trade is often cited as contributing to hellbender population declines. Unauthorized accesses allow poachers to harvest these animals, and confound Park efforts at enforcement.

As an avid angler, I appreciate that vegetated gravel bars store rock, reducing sedimentation and creating important habitat for sport fish and their prey. Unauthorized accesses, ATV and horse trails, coupled with horse crossings and vehicles on gravel bars, increase erosion and the instability of gravel bar habitats. Allowing these activities to continue would go against the stated purpose of the Ozark Scenic Riverways, to protect the natural and cultural heritage of the tract.

To me, restriction of motor craft in the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork makes total sense. These are the narrowest stretches of river, least suited to motorboat traffic, where boat traffic would have the most environmental damage to the stream bed and banks, and where conflict between motor boats and paddling enthusiasts would be most frequent. While I understand motor craft are occasionally used to provide aid to other park users, any recreational activity is going to come with inherent risks, and we cannot ignore the dangers posed by the misuse of motor boats to the boaters as well as other park users. The more restrictive A and B proposals would still allow the use of motor boats in the Riverways, in downstream portions of the river which are most suitable for their operation. In the case of giggers, I would happily support a seasonal restriction on motorboat use on the upper Current River, allowing them to be used from October to April of each year.

I support the idea of redistributing authorized river accesses throughout the property, in order to alleviate crowding on popular stretches during the summer months. I would support strengthening the canoe concessionaire system, and potentially restricting the number of watercraft which can be launched from various accesses. I don't want to paint the horse, ATV, and motor boat crowd as the only negative activities occurring on the Riverways, and I am well aware of the litter, environmental damage, and reduced visitor experience which results from excessive float traffic.

Although I don't have the privilege of living near the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, my family has been visiting the Riverways for four generations, and I believe that ought to count for something. Experiencing the Current and Jacks Fork played a fundamental role in my childhood, and on some level helped clarify my career path. I graduated from the University of Missouri with a Bachelor's degree in Fisheries and Wildlife Management, I have worked for the Missouri Department of Conservation and the US Geological Survey, and I am currently obtaining a Masters Degree in biology, with full intent on spending my professional career protecting native biodiversity and the integrity of aquatic ecosystems.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2269    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 14:16:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As an individual that values the opportunities of getting outdoors and enjoying the waterways,through fishing and camping, I oppose this project to close off the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to the public.  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2270    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 14:17:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We are loving this river to death! We need to manage it for future generations. I have used the river for over 30 years in many different ways. Camping, trout fishing, canoe/kayak and hiking have been just some of the ways I have used the National Park. There are too many motorized vehicles and animals in the river. If the current use continues it will not be sustainable for future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2271    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 14:26:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form



**Correspondence:** As I consider the needs of my descendants a hundred years from now, I am in favor of Alternative "A" because it maintains the maximum level of primitive land. I understand the desire of local residents to maintain their traditional lifestyle, but as the country as a whole continues to grow in future years the need for remote wilderness will grow in importance.

It is important that maximum effort be made to limit the use of motorized boats, ATVs, and other vehicles, thereby leaving as much of the park as possible in as near a natural state as possible.

It is also important to improve enforcement of existing regulations and to reduce the level of obscene and disgusting "Jersey Shore"-like behavior by a limited number of individuals who can ruin the experience for everyone else. At some times nowadays it is just not pleasant to take a family there. Opening the park to more motorized vehicles and additional concessionaire activity will likely lead to that kind of behavior becoming even more common.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2272    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 14:26:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a retired business owner, land owner, and employee of a large international company covering the Ozark National Riverways system for 40 years, including Arkansas. I belong to no particular political party and have served on numerous boards and committees in my days on this great planet.

Something needs to be done and it needs to be done SOON to protect this incredible asset we love. My mothers family owned propety in the OSNR corridor for 4 generations and my fathers family was granted property by Spanish Land Grants. You cannot and will not ever be able to duplicate what we have here.

I have not been on any of the streams nor visited the parks in this area for 5 years. They disgust me too often. And not spent more than a day there in 9 years. It seems now that our government and high dollar political contributors wish to turn this ecosystem into another Las Vegas. The jet-boaters, incredible caricatures of the backwoods, uneducated sloths, people think of when discussing Ozark Life, along with the pot smoking, beer can throwing revelers and worst of all, the ATV morons, have absolutely taken control of this park. Speaking with law enforcement officers of all types will tell you that the situation is out of control. ATV riders thumb their noses at any attempt by law enforcement to quell their antics that have ruined the aquatic life in numerous areas of the streams. Land owners have attempted to stop the trashing of the stream banks that have resulted in senseless loss of human life. But have a candid conversation with those locals who love the riverways for all that they CAN BE and you will find the sentiment to feel sorry for the landowner and not the beligerent dope who invaded his property, believe me....

I am thought of as a very conservative person, politically. But I believe that we need regulations that will turn this senseless evolution of this watershed around. NOW... If you need to raise my rather hefty taxes to do so, do it... Stop the wrist slapping on the law breakers and pass regulations where the ATV's and Jet Boats can be confiscated. You must increase the law enforcement count on the water, NOW. If we do nothing, or worse, do something that is so inadequate, but done to show we did something at least, this will be lost.

This waterway was not granted special regulations so that Neanderthal ATV riders can scare and terrorize kindergarten children. Which happened to me in 2003. The county officer told me later that it was our word against theirs and a dozen children from 75 miles away would not make a good witness. It was not granted its special status so that canoe livery operators could profit from their delivery of drunken party goers to this resource. No, it was not granted special status so that law breaking jet boaters could speed thru areas of the river at break-neck speeds with no consideration for others.

I have met Park service people and had long conversations all over this great country with them in the last 40 years. I have found them to be real caretakers of our environment and they actually care about long term considerations. Just last month while visiting my home at Fort Morgan, Alabama I spoke with an employee of the Park Service while my wife and I were hiking one of the trails by our beach home. When told of our home area she immediately told me how lucky I must be to live close to such a beautiful area and spoke glowingly of the Mo Conservation Commission and their incredible mission and how successful they were at preserving our areas and how it is under fire from the profiteers for less regulation at any cost.

There is a small but vocal group of people in this area that believe that if something is theirs, they can do with it as they like. And it reminds me of a very close friend, who after college, became a caseworker for the Div of Family services. He was based in Salem, Mo. A couple of years later we were fishing together and he told me of this "if it's mine, I can do what I want" attitude. His attempting to visit children in remote areas of southern Missouri and finding children who had never been to a school (this was in 1974) and there were children having children. Young

girls impregnated by close relatives as young as 13. It was sickening to hear. But this is the same attitude that is shown in the same area concerning land rights.

I beg of you to do the right thing. You don't see this type of carnage on the White River in Arkansas, nor the Red River. The Spring, Strawberry and Black Rivers in Arkansas are so gorgeous. Why can't you do something?

If you are afraid of Representative Smith, let those of us who help people get elected deal with this. Afterall, his parents have been chronic law breakers in this State for decades with their animal abuse crimes.

For decades one of my great enjoyments has been the winter float trips my son and I have enjoyed. It is the best time of the year to see what God has bestowed on us. Wildlife is abundant and the fishing is incredible in December and February. Before I pass on thru my life I hope to be able to take my grandchildren on this incredible journey. Don't let them take this away.

Feel free to quote me on any of this letter and PLEASE support the 'A' proposition for the future of my children and their children.

William Michael Pashia (and family)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2273    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 14:28:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPS,

Please do whatever you can to preserve Missouri's national park! I have travelled all over the country and lived near and visited several of our National Parks.....but I am confused at how little enforcement I see at my home park. More structure and PERMITS only makes sense and again, I see this kind of regulation at other parks, so what is the problem with doing it here at home? I am sure you know that the long term care and protection of a natural resource like this is bigger than the personal needs of individuals and we all need to keep that as our focus. What will preserve the rivers for future generations is truly all that matters! If the rivers are clean, safe and pristine all of the local folks stand to benefit greatly from that, not the opposite. Let folks that want to park their cars on gravel bars and litter and listen to loud music simply visit another one of our many rivers. Let our National Park be a National Park!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2274    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 14:41:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Having read the plan, I am in favor of Alternate A. I have been floating the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers since 1978 and have seen these rivers gradually deteriorating. The use of motorized vehicles, motorized boats and horses have left lasting damage to the ecosystem. This has also led to over crowding and misuse of the rivers. These rivers need to be returned to their pristine beauty and that can only be accomplished by allowing only non-motorized boats and walk in camping. The fact that motorized vehicles can drive up to gravel bars is ruining the wilderness experience for everyone. The fact that Missouri can have a wilderness area is wonderful-but it has to be kept that way. We have plenty of lakes for motorized boating!!! Please help restore this area to a unique experience that makes visitors want to come to the rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2275    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 14:41:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I like the no alternative action the best. We do not need to government to intrude more in our lives than what is done already. I like the system the way it is now. We enjoy the trail system the way it is not. I would not like to see fewer tails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2276    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 14:43:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2277    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 14:51:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** my wife, friends, and family have been canoeing and camping the Current and Jacks Fork rivers for many years. while no plan is perfect, we would agree with the park service that option B is the best choice. we would rather see less horse crossing of the streams, rather than more, but overall it seems like a good compromise.  
we look forward to many more years of canoeing (or floating as our missouri friends call it) on these beautiful ozark streams.  
thank you for the chance to comment,  
Allen and Mary Jo Fleming

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2278    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 15:00:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I ve lived here my whole life and can't believe what the park service is doing to its own people as for me and my family we vote no change and if you do change . I hope the people get together and take it from the park and give it to the state.".....

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2279    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 15:03:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** i¼Ozark National Scenic Riverways  
Michael Reynolds, Midwest Regional Director National Parks Service  
601 River Front Drive  
Omaha, NE 68102Â4226

RE: Draft General Management Plan/Wilderness Study/Environmental Impact Statement Dear Mr. Reynolds,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan/Wilderness Study/EIS. This letter contains the formal comments of the International Mountain Bicycling Association (IMBA). We at IMBA, urge you to give increased consideration for mountain biking for this and future plans. We oppose the noÂ action plan, which will continue the prohibition of mountain biking on all trails within the Scenic Riverways. With mountain biking currently disallowed on all existing trails and bicycling on the roads

discouraged by the Scenic Riverways web page, it does not allow visitors the full range of recreational options available from other state and national areas.

Missouri was named "Best Trail State" of 2013 which has a large and active mountain bike population with IMBA chapter affiliations that if given the opportunity, would use, enhance, and help maintain public access for these trails including all user groups.

Founded in 1988, IMBA leads the national and worldwide mountain bicycling communities through a network of 80,000 individual supporters, 750 affiliate clubs, and 600 dealer members. IMBA teaches sustainable trail building techniques and has become a leader in trail design, construction, and maintenance; encourages responsible riding, volunteer trail work, and cooperation among trail user groups and land managers. Each year, IMBA members, chapters and supporting organizations conduct more than 750,000 hours of volunteer trail stewardship on America's public lands and are some of the best assistants to federal, state, and local land managers.

Bicycling is low impact, active recreation that enhances the visitor experience

Mountain Bicycling is Low Impact: Numerous scientific studies exist regarding the natural resource impacts of mountain biking showing that mountain bicycles do not disturb the environment any more than hiking, and significantly less than equestrian and motorized uses.\*

Active Recreation: Bicycling broadens the recreational offerings and helps Americans get exercise. It connects people with the natural world and is fun. Fun, active recreation directly contributes to the physical and mental well being of the people of the United States.

Relevancy for Youth: Many parks lack relevance with today's youth - bicycling is a great way to help kids fall in love with parks and become future stewards. According to the Outdoor Industry Foundation, bicycling is the number one gateway activity that gets kids outside and ultimately interested in other activities such as hiking, camping, and fishing. Kids don't fall in love with the outdoors at a visitor center or

IMBA.com • PO Box 7578 • Boulder • CO • 303.545.9011 • 303.545.9026

1/4

information kiosk, they want to explore and have fun.

Improves Visitation and Visitor Experience: Visitation numbers are down at many NPS units. Improving opportunities for bicycling and promoting trails tourism could benefit economic conditions for nearby communities. Once inside the Park, visitors on trails traveling by foot or bicycle can immerse themselves in the natural experience rather than simply observing it from roads inside cars and RVs.

Mountain Bikers Volunteer: Many NPS trails are in disrepair. Annually, mountain bicyclists conduct almost one million hours of trail work on public lands. Volunteers from the mountain bike community can help build environmentally sound, sustainable trails.

Thank you for your time and careful consideration of our comments. We look forward to a productive relationship in the future. Please feel free to call us (303) 545-9011 (Boulder Office) or email ([steve.schneider@imba.com](mailto:steve.schneider@imba.com)), If we can be of further assistance.

Respectfully Submitted,

Steve Schneider  
South Central Regional Director  
International Mountain Bicycling Association

\*See Jeffrey L. Marion, Assessing and Understanding Trail Degradation: Results from Big South Fork National River and Recreational Areas, United States Department of Interior (2006) (finding that bicycle trails were the least eroded, narrowest, and least muddy of the trails studied, including hiking, equestrian, ATV, and mixed-use trails; Luke Chiu & Lorne Kriwoken, Managing Recreational Mountain Biking in Wellington Park, Tasmania, Australia, Annals of Leisure Research, Vol. 6, No. 4, 339-361 (2004) (finding no significant difference in the surface wear on a control plot by hikers and mountain bicyclers); and John Wilson & Joseph P. Seney, Erosional Impacts of Hikers, Horses, Motorcycles and Off-Road Bicycles on Mountain Trails in Montana, Mountain Research and Development, Vol. 14, No. 1, 77-88 (1994) (finding no difference between the erosional

impacts of hikers and mountain bicyclers in a controlled study, and noting that horses cause the most erosion as does motorcycle riding on wet trails).

1/4IMBA.com PO Box 7578 Boulder CO 303.545.9011 303.545.9026

1/4

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2280 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 15:05:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I've enjoyed having access to the river and the gravel bar all my life. My family has always had some vacations where we have camped. While camping we would go fishing in the boat and bring back supper and cook at are camp site. These are things I have passed down to my son and now I hope to pass down to my grandchildren.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2281 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 15:08:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** You people suck

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2282 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 15:11:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** William N. Black  
Superintendent - ONSR

Dear Mr. Black,

In an ideal world, Plan A would be beneficial, but a compromise such as Plan B might be more practical.

The ONSR/GMP needs to strongly support a plan that provides natural resource protection along the Current and Jacks Fork rivers. The management plan should protect clean water, natural habitat and wildlife by providing non-motorized recreation on most of the rivers and limiting the horsepower limits to 60/40 to other segments.

When the NPS closes all undesignated roads and trails, keeps motorized recreation off gravel bars, and limits the amount of horseback riding as needed to protect water quality, then the NPS needs to hire more security personnel to enforce the new rules.

We were glad to see the planned designation of the Big Spring primitive area to be a protected wilderness area.

We have many happy memories of the ONSR: caving trips, canoe trips, and combo caving-canoe trips as well as visiting all the beautiful springs. But as we get older, some trips are a bit too difficult, but we appreciate access points to the river, springs and caves.

The NPS closed cave policy needs to be reviewed. You have many NPS cave experts, e.g. Scott House, Dan Drees, who can provide input. There are many volunteer cavers who are working in the Pioneer Forest area who also can provide input.

A big thanks goes to the NPS for all their work on developing this GMP.

Sincerely,  
Lois and Joe Walsh

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2283 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 15:13:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I don't think any action should be taken. In their current state, the Rivers are still being cared for. Throughout the summer I enjoy spending time camping and boating with friends. Since we don't live in the same area anymore the Log Yard has become our meeting place through the summer. It would be devastating to have our rights limited or taken away to where we are no longer able to enjoy the river together. I thought areas like this were made for enjoyment and this type of recreational use!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2284    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 15:22:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There are a few experiences in life that not everyone gets to enjoy. The beauty of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is one of those things. I grew up a few hours from the area and was not familiarized with it until I met a family that now treats me as their own. To them, and their town, the rivers mean everything. It's a sense of heritage, recreation, and home. Why is it that they should be restricted from enjoying the rivers? These people clean the rivers and treat them with respect. Creating limits and restrictions takes the rivers away from these people, what are they left with after that? It has been a huge part of their lives since they have been living. No actions should be taken to restrict or limit any use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2285    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 15:24:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a landowner within the park, with about 100 acres upriver from Cedargrove subject to a scenic easement. My family purchased the property, which includes a small old farmhouse, in 1956. I feel I have a unique perspective on the issues affecting the park, but I will address only two:

1. When my parents sold the scenic easement when the park was established, we received a document containing explicit rules and restrictions on the use of our land as private owners within the park. These include such things as the prohibition of running cattle, harvesting timber, operating a commercial enterprise, erecting new buildings, etc. My family understood and accepted these conditions, and in fact welcomed the policies which would tend to protect and preserve the wild nature of the park. Through all these years we have scrupulously upheld our responsibilities to use our land carefully, causing little or no impact on the environment. We have trusted the park authorities to take these restrictions and duties seriously also.

I have heard by the grapevine that some private landowners have been granted variances to build unsuitable, large dwellings and possibly to utilize unofficial river access points. I find it very disappointing, assuming these stories are true, that the park has abandoned its duty to enforce the provisions of the scenic easements. A concern I have is that the park has not communicated with us at all, over the last fifty years. Perhaps the park needs to stay in touch with landowners and remind them of the policies which are applicable. This topic has not been addressed in the new proposed management plan, which I believe is a serious oversight.

2. In the proposed management plan (all three options), it is recommended that a high-water bridge be built at Cedargrove to replace the low-water bridge. This seems to me to be a huge, unnecessary boondoggle unless someone is trying to provide work for a local construction company. I am intimately familiar with the Cedargrove bridge and realize that the river rushes over it after heavy rains, about once or twice a year. The road crossing the bridge is not an important thoroughfare for anyone that I can think of. The park authorities must provide serious, logical, scientific data to support this planned construction, which seems totally unnecessary and wasteful. Surely the park's money can be spent on something more important to the citizens, such as more salaries for park rangers who will help enforce the new policies.

In conclusion, without going into detail about horses, trails, and horsepower, I will say that I support Alternative A but could live with Alternative B. Thank you for taking my comments into account.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2286    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 15:31:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I vote for the no action plan. We as taxpayers should be able to use all of the area. We are as a rule careful with our resources and know how blessed we are to have this beautiful area in our state. Please let us

enjoy it!!We are horse back riders who are careful to follow the Leave No Trace ethics.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2287 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 15:38:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a Missouri citizen who frequently enjoys the natural wonder of the Ozark National Scenic River-ways, I support the most aggressively preservationist course of action. Given that the public will not make the best decisions for itself regarding natural resources, it is the duty of government organizations to impose rules that will force them to. Those rules should put environmental preservation and protection above public recreation. If I personally have to forfeit my rights to certain uses of Missouri's natural resources to ensure that they are kept safe, then I will do so gladly.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2288 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 15:40:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Leave Ozark National Scenic Riverways alone. It is just fine the way it is. We do not need nor do we want the proposed restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2289 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 15:41:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service:

Thank you for letting me comment regarding your General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

I have been losing a little sleep over how I can effectively comment in order to convince you to go with Alternative B.

I first became familiar with the area in the 1970's while being a youth counselor for my church. For several summers we enjoyed canoe trips on the Current and the Jack's Fork Rivers.

More recently, we visited Eminence and the nearby spring last summer while our daughter participated in a MO. Dept of Conservastion/ Lincoln Univsersity internship there in the National Forest. It was then that I learned of the severe damage done to the beautiful natural features by overuse, abuse, and lack of regulation. In particular, the hiking trails are difficult to walk due to damage from horses hooves. Invasive plants are smothering out the natural habitat. Motorized vehicles are causing erosion.

I do value freedom, but there are many individuals who through ignorance or self-centered lack of concern need the guidance of rules and regulations in order to protect the environment and preserve the rights of others to enjoy nature.

I definitely urge you to proceed in the path of more protection and less development and hope that you are granted the staff needed to provide it.

Thank you for the work you have done drafting these plans. It is obvious that they have been well thought through.

Please go with Alternative B.

Sincerely,

Charlotte Skornia

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2290 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 15:49:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a former Commissioner of the Missouri Department of Conservation, 2001 - 2007, I know how special and valuable are the Ozark streams, especially those of the Current River watershed, both for their rare biodiversity itself and for their recreational, psychological, and spiritual benefit to mankind. I also know how damaged and severely threatened they are by horse, vehicle, and intense boating activity.

No one, no matter where they live, has the right to abuse the "Ozark National Scenic Riverways". They belong to all of us, present and future.

"We abuse land because we see it as a commodity belonging to us. When we see land as a community to which we belong, we may begin to use it with love and respect."

â€” Aldo Leopold

I favor the plan, I believe A, that will allow people to experience the streams and land, but that will halt the destruction, not just slow it down. We are proverbially "killing the goose that laid the golden egg".

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2291    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 15:52:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a horseback rider and camper and have been riding and camping in and near the OSNR for 10 years now, ever since we moved to Missouri. It is my favorite place in the Ozarks. I am in favor of Alternative C.

We need additional designated trails and stream crossings, especially in the upper Current River area. We camp at Big Creek Trail Rides and ride there every spring and fall. We need many miles of trails - this keeps us from riding on crowded trails and is easier on the environment. Also, horses need access to water - and lots of it. They can drink 20 gallons or more a day when it is warm and must have access to water.

Why are you closing 65 miles of trails and only replacing them with trails with less mileage? We need more trails and more miles, not fewer. Those of us with gaited horses can cover many miles a day in comfort (15 - 20 miles) and love to ride in the OSNR because it is so beautiful. We need to have many designated equestrian trails with access to water. There should be plenty of trailhead parking, parking areas and camping areas.

Horses are a major economic force in Missouri and bring many dollars (thousands and thousands, if not more) to this area. It would not be a good thing if the area horse camps are forced out of business. People come here from all over the US to ride in the OSNR. We had friends come last fall from Arizona - we took them to Big Creek. We spend six weeks every year riding in the Ozarks - this is my favorite place to ride!!!

I should add that nearly all of my riding in the OSNR is in the upper Current River area - I have ridden in the Eminence area only once.

I am also a member of Show Me Back Country Horseman (SMMBCH) and Secretary/Treasurer of Southwest Missouri Trail Riders (although I am not speaking for either one). SMMBCH has a clean-up ride in the upper Current River area in the spring. We are always picking up trash. As a horseman, I take an interest in preserving trails for future generations.

In 10 years of riding in the OSNR - upper Current River - I have never seen a hiker on the trail. I see floaters and fishermen and people playing along the rivers - but not out on the trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2292    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 16:00:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form



**Correspondence:** I live in the 8th district represented by Hon. Jason Smith, and he has asked for public comments on proposed changes to policies affecting the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Rep. Smith has been a strong supporter of commercial and private development of the two rivers involved. Of course, all the boat operators in this region give Rep. Smith huge political donations - -which is by far a more important consideration to him than than the idea of preserving the quality of these rivers for future generations to visit and see. In some of his reports to local newspapers, he said that the original purpose of the Riverways legislation passed by Congress was "to insure unlimited access." These comments are not true. In 1963-4, I worked as a student employee at the office of Senator Symington while attending graduate school at George Washington University. And I well remember that virtually the entire Missouri delegation supported this legislation as a way to protect for future generations to be able to see these pristine rivers - - some of the few remaining ones in the nation. At the time, these Missouri lawmakers said the last thing they wanted to see was what they call "a Bagnell Dam atmosphere" at these rivers. If these lawmakers were here today, they would be shocked to see how these two Missouri rivers are being abused by thousands of boaters and others who have no concern about how they are damaging the fragile ecosystems of these two rare natural rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2293    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 16:00:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the No-Action Alternative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2294    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 16:01:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No action,the moter boats,60/40 save tourist lives. There are never park rangers or park maint. workers ever cleaning up our rivers. WHY? These riverways where taken by Fed. Park, for recreation,boating, trappers,canoeing,kayaking,hikers,4wheelers,hourses,wagon trains,loggers,bikes, caving..But his is no longer an option,we have steel gates, or metal bars accross 90% o them,,, You can't even keep round springs cave open. Why? This is a tourist town,leave it alone. We have a hard time keeping any business open now. The St.Louis people want a wilderness area,an let the park take care of it,,, Now thats a joke..They cant take care of what they have.Hire more local people,we need jobs too. I would like to make 13.00- 20.00 dollars per hour...We don't want to call the PARK SERVICE, for permission to use our rivers. Thank you for the chance to voice my opionion. Now leave us alone, for good.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2295    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 16:15:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alternative A. All of the illegal access roads to the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers that have appeared over the years need to be closed, the closures enforced, and the damaged areas restored. All motorized vehicles, particularly ATVs, should be banned from gravel bars and all Park land. The Buffalo River in Arkansas can serve as a model of how the rivers can be managed.

The horse trails along and through the rivers and streams need to be closed or rerouted elsewhere.

Wilderness designation for the area around Big Spring should be actively pursued, and concurrently managed as if they were already designated wilderness.

Boat horsepower limits on the rivers need to be decreased, but most importantly, enforced.

Thank you for allowing comment on the plan. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways are a wonderful resource and deserving of every protection that can be given them.

Jim Young

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2296    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

## Correspondence:

Superintendent Bill Black  
Ozark National Scenic Riverways  
P. O. Box 490  
Van Buren, Missouri 63965  
sent by U S Mail and e-mail  
[www.parkplanning.nps.gov/ozar](http://www.parkplanning.nps.gov/ozar)  
[dena\\_matteson@nps.gov](mailto:dena_matteson@nps.gov)  
Public Comment 2-7-2014  
Dr. Michael V. Garvey  
208 Pitman Hill Road  
St. Charles, Mo. 63304

### Draft Management Plan of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways

I am grateful to personally suggest concerns and recommendations to the NPS regarding the Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Superintendent Bill Black stated "Because this is a "Draft" plan, we recognize that there are going to be details we need to adjust or clarify. This is the intent of public review- to help us identify where we need to make those adjustments." Although recreation and public use are important issues for any national park; The citizen volunteer group Greenway Network's mission is to "conserve natural resources, encourage sound management of the watersheds and protect the quality of life for the residences." underlies our prior comments. Greenway's Comment which I gave to the NPS during the public meeting in St. Louis (attached) stated that we preferred Alternate A to best protects the natural resources and watershed. The NPS agreed with that conclusion.

This comment from myself alone. I should first say that Alternative A is also my recommendation. I felt that I should also address some specific concerns under your preferred Alternative B. These comments are not comments from Greenway Network as it would be difficult to get consensus on so many issues presented in the short time remaining for public comment. But, the board may still decide to send a second comment If we are able to have consensus.

Present damage to the fragile ecosystem is directly resulting from public use and recreation. I now includes some recommendations regarding management practice which need to be adjusted in the NPS recommended Alternate B.

As you are well aware, the fragile, karst ozark uplands require stringent guidelines for public use to both improve and to maintain the watershed's pristine character and its national significance guaranteed for our children's children and beyond. Without such guarantees in place there will be no "public use or recreation" because the watershed will have been degraded to the extent that both tourists will not come and the local related economy will fail.

As you are aware during the public meetings, Politicians and some local residence have pushed for the NPS lands to return to Missouri State control. I am grateful for the NPS presence and are sorry for that insult. The Missouri Legislature has denied funding for the present state parks and would not be able to staff, fund, maintain and operate the properties. We need you! So does this Ozark watershed. The NPS has a history of finding, conserving, preserving, and managing of the lands the late Pete Seeger immortalized; "This land is your land!" I understands and recommends heartily the establishment of a new "Wilderness Designation" it would benefit the very ones who reject it the most. It would bring both regional, national and international tourism and respect for the oldest mountains, most caves and springs and the only free flowing, still healthy stream watershed of the union I might add in jest which is not "blessed" with a dam. My involvement in conservation started with the most amazing and successful push to not build a dam on the Meramec River.

NPS mentioned in the draft plan a desire for increased outreach and networking. I would like to see that some road access points to the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers be used as locations for portable rest room and sinks if required by the health department to reduce nitrate and solid waste loading in the streams and to help the local economy. Perhaps this could be partly or wholly paid for by the NPS to a local provider? Included in this Public Comment is a letter sent prior to Superintendent Mr. Bill Black which outlined this suggestions. Also mentioned was a suggestion to Network with NPS in the design of a laminate, self sticking notice to be placed on the back of the bus chairs of all

the canoe outfitters using the park. This could be something that Greenway Network printed and set up with the outfitters using the park. It could also include a map showing the locations of these portable toilets and give any additional information which NPS may desire. For instance, "no glass bottles permitted or trash removal using the provided mesh bags". Please feel free to call me, Dr. Michael Garvey about these suggestions at your convenience at 636 441 2777.

Below find some personal suggestions to help maintain and improve the water quality and health of the park:

\* The Upper Jacks Fork River from the western boundary to Bay Creek is a most fragile, karst, headstream upland watershed and should be preserved with a zoning designation of "primitive" and not "natural". Many rare and endangered species are found in the upper section of the Jacks Fork River, including:

1. *Campanula rotundifolia* Bluebells of Scotland
2. *Galium boreale* Northern bedstraw
3. *Plantago cordata* Heartleaf plantain
4. *Cheilanthes lanosa* Hairy lip fern
5. *Goodyera pubescens* Rattlesnake plantain
6. *Cypripedium calceolus* tall yellow ladyslipper
7. *Cypripedium parviflorum* small flowered ladyslipper
8. *Silene regia* Royal catchfly
9. *Aster furcatus* forked aster
10. *Delphinium exaltatum* tall larkspur
11. *Sedum ternatum* Stonecrop
12. *Zigadenus elegans* Mountain deathcamas
13. *Gratiola viscidula* Hedge hyssop
14. *Helenium virginianum* Virginia sneezeweed
15. *Viola pallens* Small white violet
16. *Phlox bifida* Sandphlox
17. *Amsonia ciliata* Ciliate bluestar
18. *Ribes odoratum* Golden current
19. *Berberis Canadensis* American barberry
20. *Matalea oblique* climbing milkweed
21. *Waldsteinia fragarioides* Barren strawberry
22. *Hamamelis virginiana* Eastern witch hazel
23. *Liparis loeselii* Loessel's twayblade
24. *Trillium pusillum* Ozark trillium
25. *Tradescantia longipes* Ozark spiderwort
26. *Trautvetteria caroliniensis* Carolina bugbane
27. *Sullivantia sullivantii* Sullivant's coolwort
28. *Athyrium pycnocarpon* Glade fern
29. *Spiranthes odorata* Ladies tresses

\* The NPS should not expand or upgrade the "Blue Spring Campground" and it should be not be "developed". This karst area with a pristine spring and sinks also contains many rare plant species. This natural resource needs the protection supplied with a designated "resource-based recreation" not "developed".

\* The Upper Jacks Fork between the western boundary and Bay Creek especially during low flow cannot support any motor boats without damage to the aquatic invertebrates in the gravel substrate and motor oil and gas contamination. The Current River should limit the HP to 40 HP including even jet type motors. These boats disturb the gravels and the oils impairs the streams. A permitting system for the less than 40 HP flat bottom John Boats on the Current River is needed.

\* Horse trails should be relocated wherever possible out of the flood plain areas within the entire Ozark National Scenic Riverways because of the loading, which harms the water quality. There are many miles of "Undesignated Horse Trails" which all need to be "Designated" or removed. All river crossing points of "designated" horse trails

needs clearly mapped and reduced in number.

- \* The Horse Camps in the Upper Jacks Fork are point source pollution and should be removed especially from the flood plains which are sensitive. There should not be a 25 horse campground at Blue Spring. This is a very bad idea because of the wastes in the flood plain and invasive plants resulting from the hay.

- \* A permitting system for the horses on the river is needed.

- \* Increased use of non-motorized mountain bikes would both expand the recreational use and not impact the water quality of the rivers. It is a great idea! The users could help NPS to properly maintain the bike trails under NPS oversight. This is done in St. Charles with our County Parks systems.

- \* Archery Ranges could be included. Local archery clubs could help set up and maintain them.

- \* Disc Golf ranges could be included. Disc golf users or clubs could help set them up and maintain them,

- \* Hiking trails are also a great expansion of public use with minimal negative impacts to the watershed. They should be promoted but need patrol and maintenance by the NPS. They should not coincide with the "Designated" horse trails. Local users could help design and maintain them.

- \* ATV's are not allowed in the Park grounds. They should not be on the gravel bars, flood plains, horse, hiking or mountain biking trails. They cause excessive erosion.

- \* The ATV users now use all trails and horse trails, this issue needs to be addressed with enforcement before any expansion of any possible additional trails or trail systems in the Park are considered. This was a source of many public comments at the public hearings.

- \* Motor vehicles and ATV 's do not belong on gravel bars. The oil and gas lowers the water quality and the stream disturbance kills the aquatic invertebrates in the gravel substrate.

- \* NPS should be stewards to resist the persistent pressures for mineral prospecting which always then leads to mining and the potential for major degradation of the upland topography and the entire watershed. In the past lead mining tailings has found it's way to springs with disastrous impacts.and adjacent lands within the watersheds

- \* Pressure for local gravel mining and use for roads should also be resisted, as it results in a complete change in hydrogeology and alteration of the pristine free flowing, fragile nature of the ozark uplands.

- \* Local non-professional archeologists could display their collection "on loan" along with NPS collections at a NPS museum or park office to help educate and network with the public and address the cultural history of the region. All to often these private collection are dispersed after the collector dies and the cultural value of these artifacts and the historic locations they were found are lost.

- \* A village archeological site might be researched, documented and possibly the village site could be rebuilt based upon the found remains. It could be done using local residence, students or non professional archeologists under the direct supervision of trained archeologists on staff at NPS.

- \* The powder mill needs major protection from flooding damage and the grounds in the flood plain need to be off limits to development. Is there a consideration to use the Mill again for public and cultural benefits?

- \* The upland watersheds which feed the water resources of the streams are under the jurisdiction of the MoDNR. There needs to be a point person to work with NPS to address point source pollution and how to address it with the local residence so the stream is not degraded.

- \* All failing septic systems need to be repaired on the flood plain.

\* NPS could network with local Government agencies and the local Stream Teams to paint warnings on all Storm Water Sewers Covers in the developed areas of Eminence and Van Buren. Greenway Network is presently working with local governments in a similar way to paint 6000 sewer covers in St. Charles using local scout groups, residence and students.

\* Perhaps the NPS could work with the local Univ. of Mo. Extension Centers or local garden clubs to discuss ways to address point source contamination reduction using wetlands, native prairies, rain gardens or vegetative swales near loosing streams or sinks.

\* NPS employees and rangers could take the stream Team introductory level testing in Van Buren and set up their own Stream Team to network with the children and public about the importance of issues related to the degradation of the watershed. What a bonding experience for the NPS! Also they could educate the rest of the NPS about the potential to incorporate the Mo. Stream Team concept nation wide.

\* NPS could network with the Stream Team Program and turn the old fishing lodge (Welsh Lodge) into an educational school/camp for the children of Missouri. The Stream Teams locally and the NPS Ozark Stream Team, if created, could use this area as an outdoor educational classroom to teach both the public and the employees of the NPS about the importance of the aquatic invertebrate balance of healthy rivers and water testing to show point source pollution.

\* NPS could network with the St. Louis Zoo to stage areas to incorporate the Hellbender population back to healthy stream sections of the park. Hellbender habitat areas need both protection and new areas need to be added and there needs to be a definite designation of protection for such habitat. The scientific, biologic reason for the species loss needs to be detailed.

\* NPS could consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife and Mo DOC to consider stocking of other aquatic species I.e. Rainbow or Brook Trout if reasonable

\* Bat species are under attack by pesticides, habitat loss and white nose fungus. Many cave openings need protection and possibly gates maintained or installed.

\* Bees also are having stress from pesticide use and loss of diversity of flower types. Local bee keepers could be allowed to place hives on park grounds. Both bees and bats are major pollinators.

\* Locate possible site for a native prairie and possibly work with the Missouri Prairie Foundation or Shaw Garden in St. Louis to recreate a native wetland with wetland plants or native prairie with native grasses and forbs.

Below find the e mail of Jan 24th described above sent to Superintendent Bill Black:

William N. Black  
Superintendent  
Ozark National Scenic Riverways  
P. O. Box 490  
404 Watercrest Drive  
Van Buren, Mo. 63965

Bill,

I had a nice discussed with you at the public meeting in St. Louis about a desire to perhaps obtain a speaker to

present a talk at a forum at the Missouri History museum titled "Weather Extremes, or the New Norm, Risk Assessment". As mentioned, the section of the draft report was an excellent overview of the crazy weather and it's impact on free flowing healthy streams in a Karst environment.

I am a board member of Greenway Network and I have attached below a copy of a Letter to the editor sent to the River Hills Traveler and the local paper which I felt actually might help inform the local public that the NPS is really out to help them with life quality and financially in the long haul. I hope it helps.

While talking to your agents, the one dealing with the maintenance, forgot his name mentioned a possible project which after a nights sleep seemed great. Namely to place a paper or laminate with a sticky back on the back of the busses which take the canoe travelers up or down stream about the tendency to urinate in the stream and use the portable units and perhaps other issues that might come from NPS? Even urination in the riparian area would be better but Agents using Bino's and property rights nuts with 44' s may be a negative to accomplish the concept.

I am hoping to convince our board that it would be a reasonable outreach for public education. I might even convince them to foot the bill? Also I was thinking another reasonable idea might be to obtain funding for the local economy to place portable johns' at road crossings.

Perhaps NPS might consider this idea in the budget, to work with the local public? Also our Stream Team is placing notices on the local sewer covers about water quality perhaps NPS may help the local stream teams down there? I also feel that it would be a good educational benefit to consider requiring the Agents to take the stream team level one certification and perhaps form a NPS Ozark Stream Team of Agents. The Stream Team program in Missouri is a wonderful outreach to the local public and they adopt local streams as their own and take on a mental idea of ownership which might help property rights conflicts. The Draft plan asked for educational outreach and Greenway is a Stream Team Association has that as a mission, we also network with agencies about River conservation. In the past we worked with NPS after the 93' Flood with some conferences with the USACE.

Please get back to me about these suggestions so I can keep the board aware, I cannot speak for the board but will need approval at our next meeting for these projects, I think they will be positive.

Dr. Michael V. Garvey  
Charlene Waggoner Pres. Greenway Network

Letter to the editor

Daddy, what happened to all the crawdads!

I am a 20 year board member of Greenway Network, a all volunteer, river conservation group in St. Charles. I am not representing them in this letter, but rather myself as a Missouri citizen, who dearly loves your Ozark Rivers. Oh here we go, you may think, another city, crazy environmental nut, more big government wanting to take our land; please do read on. Many Park Rangers at the public meeting for the management plan of National Ozark Scenic Waterways last night in St. Louis told me that the local stream team who commented on Tuesday night in Van Buren were treated with disrespect and in a very un christian manner. Rather, they were impressed with the mutual respect which was shown at the meeting in St. Louis.

Both Van Buren and Eminence can boast about the beautiful Jacks Fork and Current Rivers at their doorstep. That is why your pristine rivers gets the many economic benefits of a federal national park, run and managed directly from your federal tax dollars, the state DNR certainly cannot be expected to manage it because they are too strapped for funds. Local business thrive, you surely know some high school neighbor who works the canoes or campgrounds for the summer, or one who drives the bus, keeps them running, serves breakfast, or sells beer and bait, Wilderness areas and clean floating streams bring not only St. Louis, but even international tourists to visit, camp, spend money, float and watch their kids catch crawdads. I sincerely thank you for sharing your springs and rivers; for 54 years I have floated your crystal clear waters. I have enjoyed catching crawdads as a kid in your back yard and now my 23 and 21 year old children still catch them and I use them for bait. But I have noticed a decline.

In my early days as a kid, I spent most of my time in the local healthy small creek catching crawdads, it really

impacted my entire life. My best friend's dad felt he could kill all the mosquitoes by pouring used oil in the creek, subdivisions came, lawn treatment chemicals and road salt entered the once clear water, now the crawdads are long gone and it is a cement lined, oily, dead, dirty ditch. If I were to ask you what do you love about your home, I bet it would be the crystal clear water and the ability to fish, gig, hunt and see your kids perhaps also enjoy catching crawdads. Over the years, while floating, I have noticed your stream areas just past the cattle or failing septic fields on the flood plains and immediately see the algae. You see it also; harder to gig, rocks seem dirtier, slippery and you can't see the fish. That is why the head waters are so valued and fragile.

Greenway Network is a Stream Team Association. We teach kids to dig their feet in the currents and gravel and net and inventory the creepy crawly invertebrates that live in your back yard streams. That data is used by the MoDNR. We also clean your streams yearly during the "Mission Clean Stream". My families stream team is named "The Garvey Crawdads." The kids in your schools and your local teachers, who sign up and become stream team leaders, instill a deep, lasting appreciation in the children for really what makes up a healthy stream. Those small invertebrates and crawdads are the backbone of the food chain. They are very quick to suffocate when the oxygen level drops from excessive fertilizer, cattle, horse or human wastes, failing septic systems, oil and gas from motor boats. Like the canaries in the coal mine, they cry out, suffocate and die.

With freedom and land rights comes responsibility. I love horses and wish we lived in the days before cars, but do we really need a horse campground on the flood plain near the beautiful Blue Springs, if It adds e-coli which pollutes your drinking water and takes away your economic driver. Can we live with one less shooting range if the lead pollutes Big Springs? Do we need to expect that we should be able to use our jet props to go up stream when we know the water is too shallow and one drop of oil or gas as you well know coats the surface of a considerable amount of water depriving the aquatic life of air.

The limestone cracks and caves under your thin surface soils, rapidly moves everything after a rain which is on the surface of the ground directly to these streams using the springs, even the uplands have sinks and caves which connect directly to the springs. That is why it is called a watershed! That also includes the fertilizer or pesticides you place on your hay field or lawns and salts now covering our roads.

Those springs use to be used by the Native Americans and early settlers as drinking water. No more! Please do not suffocate the crawdads for your children and their children to enjoy through irresponsible management practices! Let the National Parks Service do their job and maintain your quality of life and property values. They really have your best interest at heart, and so do I.

Dr. Michael V. Garvey  
208 Pitman Hill Road  
St. Charles, MO 63304  
mgarvey@garveyteam.com  
phone wk 636 441 2777

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2297	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 16:28:42				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Im for Plan B even though I would like the b plan motor boat allowed speed lower. Im so tired of land our tax money bought and our tax money supports for charging for primitive camping, keep your pay campgrounds also. But let people camp for free in the free primitive areas. Keep the primitive camping free! Im so tired of land our tax money bought and our tax money supports for charging for primitive camping. Keep your pay campgrounds also. But let people camp for free in the free primitive areas.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2298	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 16:28:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I fully support the no action plan. I enjoy taking a canoe down the river and swimming, plus I also camp and horseback ride and I find this to be a wonderful place to enjoy these activities. I take a look a my home town Salem and see how much they need the tourism dollar. I think closing different river access points will

make people mad and they will not come back. People want a choice where they want to put their canoe in and also where to camp. Abiding by rules that make no sense is foolish. The horse trails are in better shape than many places I ride. Many many organizations and all elected officials state and federal say the only way to go is no action plan. Listen to these people and make some good will that the park service badly needs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2299    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 16:38:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I fully support the no action plan. I enjoy taking a canoe down the river and swimming, plus I also camp and horseback ride and I find this to be a wonderful place to enjoy these activities. I take a look at my home town Salem and see how much they need the tourism dollar. I think closing different river access points will make people mad and they will not come back. I have seen how the park service hides and tries to catch people doing something wrong instead of trying to help them. The trash cans were pulled and we have picked trash up all year. The trash will be worse than alittle erosion in the river. I am a young man and am afraid that the park service is trying to take stop about everything.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2300    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 16:40:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support alternative C. In fact, I support no more restrictions, and loosening of the restrictions in place. There obviously is no funding to take care of resources. Nearly all the historic structures entrusted to Ozark National Scenic Riverways have been allowed to rot down. You have done everything possible to restrict access to the river. It is supposed to be used and enjoyed along with being preserved. I believe this was not the intent of the establishment of this National Park.

I can't remember when I last saw a motor boat on the upper river. There certainly isn't enough noise to cause a float trip to be ruined. I think this is just an excuse to take away more rights.

Carla Stark

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2301    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 16:41:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** First, I have 6 years of college and spend a good deal of time researching on the internet. It took me a loooong time to finally find the comment link. I can imagine many people also found it frustrating and this discouraged them from commenting. If you click through your site not all roads lead to this, many go around in circles. A direct link should have been made extremely visible on your home page as it is THE current larger issue.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2302    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 16:44:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I was extremely discouraged that all the armed national park "folks" at the meeting also thought it necessary that the highway patrol just so happen to feel the need to "stop by". More than one interestingly had this same strange unction - out of the blue?? This sends a powerful message of what is in YOUR minds and it wasn't a positive one.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2303    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 16:44:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** RE: Ozark ScenicWaterway System

Please don't close trails around Eminence to trailriders. Trail riders and canoeing sustain the local economy. Shannon County is characterized by poverty and unemployment and it will worsen if trails become limited. As an Illinoisan who vacations 8 weeks per year in the Eminence area, I fearfor the local economy should trail riders stay in our home state due to trail closures in MO.

---



**Correspondence ID:** 2304 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 16:45:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the no action plan. I am afraid that if restrictions are put on the riverway that my home town of Salem will look like main street Eminence. I ride horses and cannot see much damage. I see more problem with people using the river for a bathroom. We deserve to see the many nice things along the river also. We love seeing the canoes as some times I also canoe.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2305 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 16:49:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Proposal B. If action is not taken to stop the abuse of the rivers, there will be nothing left for future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2306 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 16:49:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It was unfortunate that many national park reps. seemed to have the idea that this was just a mere "formality" that they were required to do and had little if anything at all to do with the eventual outcome. This is NOT how it is supposed to work is it? Can you explain just how the input from these meetings is addressed? I heard they are sorted through and read. Good that is a great first step. But then I would like to know by what process the input is considered. Are they read and thrown in the trash? Are they read and recorded and addressed personally? Are they read and just discussed in higher level meetings?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2307 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 16:51:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Who made the decision that the highway patrol and local deputy needed to attend and stand by the door? What were their reasons for this?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2308 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 16:53:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Who made the decision to have these meetings in the "mill around the stations" format? What was their rationale for this particular choice?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2309 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 16:58:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** These meetings did not appear to me to be effective in informing the general public as to what changes were being considered. Even the heartiest diehard would be put off by the CD. Even the summary was a huge amount of information to digest. I realize this is typical, however that doesn't make it right. I'm forced to conclude that if you really wanted to have the average person actively participating in this you would have approached conveying the information in a completely different manner.

Did you seek input on what an average individual would understand from this summary before you issued it?

Were you honestly confident they would grasp the "choices"? Or were you fulfilling your red tape obligation and didn't care whether or not it was an effective method/approach?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2310 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:02:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I quote and agree with Rep. Jason Smith, "I adamantly oppose their proposal to appease environmentalists by limiting the public use and enjoyment of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. This proposal would hurt small businesses that rely on the riverways and keep my constituents from enjoying the rivers that belong

to them."

I support the No-Action Alternative! Missouri is my home. I love to be able to use the rivers of my home. Please stop giving our home away.

This smells a lot like the UN Agenda 21 being put into practice. I do not like it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2311 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:03:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** When one is genuinely wanting to know the sentiment of a group of people, one needs to find out what format they are comfortable communicating that it. I suspect you would not be comfortable in testifying before a court regarding the options of this plan. It might make you a little nervous, less than at your best function and you might even want to avoid it if you could - yes?

The type of way most people in this area are comfortable in communicating their thoughts and ideas is not in any way shape or form in a format that has been provided for them. Why did you apparently not consider this? Or did you and am I oblivious? What process did you use to choose the "input" avenues?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2312 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:05:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** What happened to the community/local or whatever it was advisory committee that I heard was set up in the beginning of this endeavour? Is it still existing and active? If not, what happened to it and why?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2313 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:08:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to request an formal sampling of how well you succeeded in informing the public of your proposed changes to the plan? After all, if you didn't succeed in actually letting people know about it, not only was it a waste of paper and time, you really didn't fulfill your obligation.

Have you checked up on your effectiveness in getting the word out? If so, how?

I think we both may be highly disheartened to find out that those most effected by this still remain clueless of what is impending.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2314 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for allowing me to comment on your draft general management plan. There are a few things that cause me some concern. As a current CUA holder I am very interested in the suggestion of a permit system for horse trails. I currently purchase a CUA on an annual basis to allow my customers access to the few trails that are available within the park. I question whether my customers will also have to purchase a permit in the event this system is instituted? I feel this would be a double charge to visitors and not a very fair situation; I would like to suggest that serious consideration be given to this issue in the event that the permit system is instituted. I would also question whether the permit system would apply to all users of the trail system or just a specific user group i.e. hikers, bikers, horseback riders. It would seem to be discriminatory of the park to force one user group to buy a permit, but exclude everyone else from this regulation.

I am also concerned with the vagueness or lack of specificity within the plan i.e. 65 miles of horse trails will be closed, but no mention of which trails, etc. While I understand the reason behind the vagueness it also concerns me since we are given a new superintendent about every 2 years. There is very little consistency in leadership and this vagueness in the management will only add to the inconsistency. I would urge the park to reconsider this in finalizing the plan, keeping in mind the effects of new leadership every 2 years to the local people and to the park itself.

Another concern is the proposed zoning of the rivers for motorized boats. While I partially understand the need for zoning in certain areas, I don't understand the need on upper Jacks Fork and upper Current Rivers. Both of these areas are controlled by water level very effectively at the current time. The only outcome of eliminating motor boats in these areas would be to completely eliminate gigging in these zones, which I don't understand. There is very little motorized boat traffic on the upper end of either of these rivers due to water level and that isn't going to change. But, there are a lot of local folks who like to gig and trap those upper sections in the fall and winter and making this a non-motorized zone would certainly limit their user experience. I think it would be more appropriate to address the areas where a problem really exists instead of making a blanket regulation where it is not needed further alienating the local people and creating a problem where none currently exists.

Finally, I would like to address the actual legitimacy of the entire plan. The plan calls for a lot of changes that are going to require a lot of money to institute and enforce. Given that the park is currently under staffed and doesn't have a large enough budget at the current time I'm not sure the plan is even a valid proposal to the public. How much of it will actually be able to be accomplished? I think we all really need to take stock of priorities and eliminate items that are just filler. Let's stop spending millions of dollars on paper and meetings and put that money into our park! We have been 4 or 5 years getting to this point to the tune of several million dollars. Have you thought about what that money could have done for our park? This park is as important to the people who live here as it is to those who visit in the summer. It is a major component of the economy in Eminence. Without tourism Eminence would not be here and the park is a big part of the tourism here. We, the local people and park staff and administration, should be promoting visitors to the park and surrounding areas not providing deterrents to visitors. More regulation is not the answer, visibility of park staff is.

Thank you very much for allowing me to comment. I hope that you will find my point of view helpful.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2315	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 17:17:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I ADAMANTLY OPPOSE ANY AND ALL PROPOSED MANAGEMENT CHANGES ON THE OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS. I DO NOT WANT TO SEE ACCESS POINTS ALONG THE RIVER CLOSED TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC. WE NEED ACCESS ROADS AND COMMUNICATION LINES IN THESE AREAS. DO NOT RESTRICT THE USE OF MOTORIZED VESSELS IN THE PARK. DO NOT CLOSE HORSE RIDING OR HIKING TRAILS.				

MANY PEOPLE DERIVE MAKING A LIVING FROM THE RIVERWAYS.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2316	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 17:18:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I prefer the No-action Alternative. Thank you.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2317	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 17:19:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As you might have gathered, I am very interested in seeing the local area people fully participating in this. I do know you have intimidated most of them - probably unknowingly. This is a shame. In doing so, you have also spawned a good deal of resentment hopefully through unclear thinking in many people in the area. I imagine you would like to clear this up. I would be very disheartened to hear that you were just going through the motions and don't really care.				

Local sentiment may not seem to directly effect you. But I assure you it has a myriad of small consequences that definitely add up. How the local population represents you care of this area to incoming tourists is all many of them will hear. And I don't think it will be a favorable tale they tell unfortunately.

You provided a great Environmental Impact Statement on the surface. I also think it is equally important to provide a "Cultural Impact Statement". After all many, if not most people in the area are going to be profoundly effected by this.

Have you considered providing a statement like this? If so what did you conclude? If not, why did you decide not to?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2318    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:23:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As I look at the questions below this box they both focus on "how" I heard about this. Why is there not a question which asks....was this explained adequately? Do you feel you have a good grasp of the scope as well as the actual details of these plans? The questions below are assuming that your message is adequate and it is just where you put it that matters.

I would venture to say, word will get out IF you put it in a form others can understand. Do you really feel, reading your report w/objective/strange eyes that you have communicated adequately?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2319    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:24:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I live the Jacks Fork river in Shannon County. My use of the river is limited to two or three kayak river floats per year and occasional swimming in the late summers.

I'm concerned with pollution of various natures impacting the quality of the river and surrounding forest in the area. Not limited to pollution from noise, traffic, litter, off-road vehicles, animal runoff and droppings, etc.

The parks generally are under increasing pressure from visitor attendance and participation, in my opinion.

Now, a specific observation about excessive vehicle and boat trailers impacting parking availability to public meetings may be construed to a similar negative impact in the use of motorized water craft, and for this matter, the use of horses for trail rides in the river.

I'm a conservative in this matter, I guess. Please consider limiting public access for these harmful practices and continue working to maintaining and improving the good quality of the rivers and forest in southeast Missouri.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2320    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:30:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Having lived in this area many years, I've noticed that the local population is quite comfortable with town hall type meetings and this seems to be their method of choice. I understand it may not be your method of choice but your duty is to do what works, not just waste time/money. The goal here is to get the public informed and to gather honest feedback. I've studied what goes on in townhall type of meetings and while not always pleasant, it does definitely accomplish the above two goals, much more effectively than handing them a pile of paper and funneling them through a maze of tables that all look alike.

Honestly, I couldn't sense any organization to the layout at all. Nor was anything easily visible since the crowd obscured the tables.

So I would ask who made the choice to have these meetings in the mill around style and not the town hall style and why?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2321    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:30:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to see the "no change" option implemented in your 20 year plan. We already are suffering from too much government in all we do. The people along the river ways are accused of not taking care of the river when in fact they clean up after the city people who come by in canoes leaving all sorts of trash behind.

When the Sierra Club talks about coming down here to clean the river they must do it in secret.

As a members of the SHOW ME MISSOURI BACK COUNTRY HORSEMEN, we work with the park service to ensure that the trails will remain open for another generation. Many members are retirees (and veterans) who maintain the trails on a VOLUNTEER basis. The family businesses in the Big Creek area will be destroyed if the trails in that area are closed. We spend one week-end each spring maintaining trails in that area alone.

Shannon county is a poor county and its towns are plagued with empty buildings due to businesses not surviving this bad economy. Now our government is making a plan to limit the numbers of people allowed on the rivers and in the forests. Tourism is important to Shannon County.

While the environmentalists are trying to preserve things that are natural, they should consider the way of life of generations of country people living in the Ozarks. Remember the Indians? "NO CHANGE" Please.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2322    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:32:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Why were the many representatives who attended not allowed to speak to the people with their thoughts? This would have been an ideal time. And a very good time for the people to express their thoughts to their representatives by being given opportunity to ask questions/comment at a mic where everyone could hear.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2323    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:32:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I adamantly oppose your proposal to appease environmentalists by limiting the public use and enjoyment of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. This proposal would hurt small businesses that rely on the riverways and keep, we, the public, from enjoying the rivers that belong to us."

Please leave things alone in Missouri.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2324    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:34:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I adamantly oppose your proposal to appease environmentalists by limiting the public use and enjoyment of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. This proposal would hurt small businesses that rely on the riverways and keep, we, the public, from enjoying the rivers that belong to us."

Please leave things alone in Missouri.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2325    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:34:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;

- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2326    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:38:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I don't understand why the government wants to take away citizens rights to use the National Parks. I think it's awful that by taking away our right to use the Park future children will never get to enjoy something that should be their right. SHAMEFUL!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2327    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:50:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To the Management of the Ozark National Scenic Waterways, I have been visiting the River ways for nearly 40 years. My family and I have enjoyed the Jack Forks and the Current explicitly. We have camped at the CCTR when it was at the old campgrounds and ever since it moved to it's current place. We have enjoyed all the seasons, canoeing, swimming, horseback riding and camping. We have brought many of our friends from all over the country here, and they loved it and almost all still come back.

Last year we bought a little lot of ground, beside the Big Shawnee Creek, 1 mile from the Jack Forks. With hopes to move there in a year or two when we retire. We love to ride our horses and we were ecstatic when we were able to buy land there.

Now that dream of riding and enjoying the Rivers the way we have in the past may turn into a nightmare. We love the area, and don't want any harm to come to it, but we also want the privilege to enjoy it like we have in the past. Please don't take our trails and River crossings away. Please leave the Management as it is, or with as little change as possible. Please.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2328    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:51:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent,  
I've lived in Shannon County for about thirty years. I have taught school for twenty nine years and am now a retired school teacher. Over the years I have witnessed a gradual increase of rules and regulations in the National Scenic Riverways. It has reached a point that I rarely venture into the park for a fear of breaking one of the many regulations that are now in existence. The park rangers seem to be very aggressive in enforcing these rules and regulations. They foster a climate of fear and intimidation.

One of my favorite pastimes is to camp on one of the many gravel bars on the Current and the Jacks fork rivers in my small camper. It is my understanding that access to these local campsites and access points may be curtailed in the new proposals. I know that I never do anything that would damage the park environmentally. I always pick up my trash as well as anything that anyone else has left behind.

I also enjoy riding my four-wheeler on back roads. Due to the geographic nature of the park it is almost impossible to go from point A to point B without venturing into park lands. Again I am always afraid of breaking one of the many regulations.

As a school teacher, I learned over the years that I achieved better results by having fewer rules and concentrating on the few rules that were very important. It was also a very bad idea to punish everyone for the bad behavior of a few. I feel that the Park Service would like to limit everyone's enjoyment of the park because, of the behavior of a very few people. Surely there are enough rules and regulations in existence to take care of bad behavior.

I hope that the park service will reconsider all of the new proposals and not adopt any new rules and regulations.

There are enough rules in the park now. It is a shame to live only a mile from such a wonderful national treasure and be afraid to enjoy it.

Sincerely,  
Phil Greer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2329    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:53:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to know why so much information was chosen to be given at once? Can these plans be changed or staggered so that there is not so much to consider at once? I understand that is how it was probably how it was originally set up or considered most efficient in terms of bureaucracy - but it certainly doesn't yield good results. It seems that there are nice logical divisions in terms of land/river/boat/rec. Why not make it easy for all concerned? Each one of the mentioned changes deserves some real discussion.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2330    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:55:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have a small place near the Jack's Fork River west of Eminence in Shannon County, MO and I am requesting that you chose the "no change" option in your proposed plan. There are so many families in this small community that depend on the tourism brought each summer by the Current and Jack's Fork rivers.

In the twelve years that I've been here, I have seen many changes- -all intended to limit use by the public to government lands. Campgrounds have been closed and restrooms removed from areas where the common man was once welcomed. Who after all owned these lands if not the people? Government is getting to big and forgetting why it was formed.

There is room for all of us in our public lands: ATVers, hikers, boaters, horseback riders and hunters- -what would we do without the hunters to help control the deer population? The majority of people using the lands are respectful of them. It is easy for environmental groups to spout deterioration of our rivers etc. while visiting on a busy summer week-end. What they refuse to see is the locals cleaning up after the city people leave. We ARE good stewards of the forests and rivers. We don't try to keep environmental groups from our area, why can't they afford us the same courtesy. Please do not limit our access to OUR public lands- -vote "no change".

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2331    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:55:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**  
I am writing in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although I feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, I prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. I am grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

One last point I want to make is that I never understood why motorboats and ATVs are allowed in areas that deserve

full protection otherwise Alternative B is my choice.  
Christian Herzog

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2332    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:56:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am Judy Maggard Stewart from Eminence, MO. I grew up at Akers, MO on the Current River. My roots go back to the Civil War in Shannon County. I have a deep love for the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers.

The intent of the enabling legislation of 1964 had three major provisions that were of equal import, none taking president over the other. They were each on equal footing (one was not any more important than the other.) These provisions were :

1. Recreation
2. Conservation
3. Preservation

This was clearly the intent of the enabling legislation due to the fact that the National Monument failed to pass in legislation because it did not preserve traditional recreation activities such as hunting, trapping, gigging, etc. When recreation was added, the bill passed which was the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

The general management plan with the rest of the options A, B, C conflict with the intent of the enabling legislation. The plan for a wilderness area doesn't fit anywhere in this puzzle.

I propose they go back the square 1 and follow the enabling legislation. If that fails then give it back to the State of Missouri.

Thank You,  
Judy Maggard Stewart

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2333    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 18:01:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I CAN HEAR CURRENT RIVER CRY

Growing up on the Current River where the river ran through my back yard at Akers, MO makes me feel very, very fortunate to have had the opportunity to grow up in such a beautiful area and has left me with wonderful memories. The river is where I go to meditate and enjoy God's beautiful creation of nature and the beauty around it and celebrate the happiest and heal the saddest moments of my life. I absolutely enjoy swimming, canoeing, kayaking, inner tubing or just sitting in the river. I feel deprived if I don't get enough of it. I have always cried in the river when I have been terribly frustrated or devastated at whatever has occurred in my life (the loss of a loved one or some other disappointment in my life.) The river has a healing and energizing effect on me.

My love for the river and land at Akers runs very deep. The land had been passed down through my family for generations since the Civil War in my mother's family (Loreen Purcell Maggard.) Akers was the trade center for the community for miles around. Members of the Purcell family lived up and down the river from Akers. Beanie Purcell lived down the river across from Cave Springs. They farmed, trapped, fished, logged, and raised hogs and cattle to make a living. My grandfather, George C. Purcell owned the country store (on the hill above the Junction K and KK.) He owned seven sawmills and much of the land surrounding Akers. Some family members were even moonshiners. They also ran the ferryboat. Members of his family (Frank Purcell, Marion Purcell, George Purcell and finally my mother, Loreen), were the postmasters at the Akers Post Office which was inside their country store. The country store met the needs of all the community. Shoppers could shop for food, dry goods and even get a haircut. It had a potbellied stove so many hours were spent socializing and telling hunting stories and whatever was on one's mind at the time. The upstairs of the store housed the Oddfellow's Lodge. They had an initiation chair that they would have the fellow sit on and the legs would collapse. I have fond memories of tricking my friends with that chair (The lodge had disbanded before I was born.) The telephone office was there also. A member of the family had to be stationed at the phone and connect all the neighbors who received calls.

Mt. Zion Church sat at the top of the hill above Akers. The land where the church house sits was donated by my grandparents and built by the community. My father was very proud of his part in building the church. I remember riding horseback in front of Robert Crosswhite to church on most Sundays while Mt. Zion Church was operating. My family attended many baptisms at the river below the ferryboat. Revivals, singings, community dinners and



gatherings were held at Mt. Zion. It is a beautiful rock building. After the park service took over, they gave everything away that was in the building and wanted to tear it down. The Missouri State Historical Society got involved with the community members and thank God the building was saved. It is sitting there empty when it could be used as an inspiration point, museum, and be used for community events. I would like to see it restored to its original state. Rev. Yount and later Rev. Wobus preached there.

The Akers School sat on the east side of Gladden Valley Creek. In her early years, my mother taught there. My sister, Omaleta, had her for a teacher. Unfortunately, the park service tore the school building down years ago. I spent many hours playing in that building. Mom also taught for a period of time at Bluff school. The Bluff school house still stands but is in dire need of some tender loving care. Schools up and down the river have been destroyed or painted park service colors and used for storage instead of being preserved for historical purposes.

The Akers Cemetery sits on the hill overlooking Gladden Creek north of where the school sat. Both sets of my grandparents are buried there as well as aunts and cousins. My great- great grandparents on the Purcell side are also buried there. Several graves are marked with cave rock. My parents are not buried there because my mother feared the Park service would let it grow up and be destroyed. Before the national park, she and Dad and other community members took very good care of the cemetery. My brother Gene and I sit on the Akers Cemetery Board. He is the president; Richard Purcell, vice president; Jim Purcell treasurer and I am secretary at present. I never want the Akers cemetery to grow up and be destroyed like many cemeteries up and down the river. For example, the pre-Civil War Purcell family cemetery located on what was the Beanie Purcell place across from Cave Springs is grown up, grave markers lost, and cannot be found unless if you know exactly where you are going. Veterans are buried there. I never want the Akers cemetery to suffer the same fate.

After my parents were married, they built the store where it stands today. Half of the building was our home and the other half was the store. The store had a post office built in one corner of the building just like my grandparents store. My mother was the Post Master there as well as my father being the barber. It was the hub bub of the community. People gathered around the wood stove and told stories. People still traded for most everything they needed. Salesmen and traders would come through the area selling their goods and would repair what needed repairing.

Traditions and the Ozark Mountain People culture continued. The neighbors would take turns having square dancing in their homes. My father (Buck Maggard) was the fiddler on most evenings and my uncle Doc would market their moonshine. (My parents met each other at one of these dances.) Life at Akers was good.

My parents, Buck and Loreen Maggard, bought a couple of canoes from Sears and Roebuck catalog to rent to people who might want to float, fish or just enjoy the Current River. He also built a campground on both sides of the river for campers to use. My dad would use his red 1950 model one and half ton cattle truck to haul floaters to and from the put in and take out points on the river. The people would ride in the back with the cattle panels protecting them. I remember some people enjoyed the ride in the truck almost as much and their boat ride. Canoeing really became popular. He bought Grumman aluminum canoes, Osage canoes, and various brands over the years. My parents never turned anyone away on reserving a canoe. They went and bought more until they had around 300 canoes before the Ozark National Scenic Riverways bought their land by eminent domain and reduced the amount of canoes they could rent. I will never forget the devastating news that the government was taking our property for recreation, the land that was so dear to us. It felt like we had a death in the family. I will never forget when the federal marshal came to serve papers on my father. My brothers (Eugene and Dwight) and I were instructed that we could not accept the papers so we turned the marshal away three or four times because dad was not present.

Well, one evening when everyone was sitting around the stove telling stories, the marshal came in and joined us. After a while he asked if anyone knew Buck Maggard and one of the local drunks spoke up and said, "There he is!" So the papers were served!!! After the park service came in, I will never forget that feeling of emptiness that I felt when I floated the river and all the neighbors were gone. There was not any one to stop and visit or share goodies like watermelon and pastries as you floated down the river.

Currently, my brother Eugene and family have the concession at Akers. They have a canoe rental and store where things that you might need on the river can be purchased. Eighteen years ago the park service closed the campground at Akers which had really hurt the economy. It cuts to the core that land that even the Indians loved years ago and tourist once enjoyed camping upon was closed by the government so that the sounds, smells and beauty of the river at that point can't be enjoyed as it had been for years.

The beautiful farm up the river that belonged to my grandparents and later my uncle Dee and Aunt Pearlle across from Welch's Cave was also purchased by the government. It had a huge barn that housed all the animals from the chickens, sheep, horses and cows. The park service tore it down. The house (Maggard Cabin) was torn down to the log frame and is about half way restored. My aunt Pearlle and I loved fishing at the family's favorite fishing hole where she helped me catch my biggest trout.

I can hear Current River cry because all the people who grew up, loved and respected the river have had to move away. There is not anyone left to care for the land, the traditions, the culture and the structures (school houses and churches). It is the Ozark National Scenic Riverways responsibility to preserve the history and culture of the area. So far they have shirked their responsibility. It has always left a sour taste in my mouth when park service personnel have asked what a building or place looked like when it was the park service that tore it down. Rules and regulations are being implemented to govern the park and limit the amount of tourists/users. It appears that the park service does not have the funds or manpower to manage all the acreage they took from all the people. Consequently, they need to come up with a plan that will protect and take care of the river and preserve the culture and traditions of the Ozark Mountain People. Everyone needs to be able to enjoy the river, not a select few and never ever shut it down again!

Judy Maggard Stewart  
Jstewart001@centurytel.net  
573-226-3291

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2334    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 18:02:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No Action! The rivers of Missouri need to be left to the people of Missouri. The Current and Jacks Fork rivers have been a very big part of family(my) life boating, fishing, swimming. Please let the local people keep that part of our lives

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2335    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 18:08:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have had family in that area for over 100 years and have enjoyed that river since I was a little girl and cannot see where it has lost it's beauty or water quality at all, which means if it isn't broke please Don't try to fix and just ruin it for people who live in that area to please environmentalist who have never even been there, and just want to control how people use their own natural resources. Please TAKE THE NO ACTION OPTION!!!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2336    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 18:15:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The title "Environmental Impact Statement" puzzles me. In the summary it doesn't seem to be about environmental impact at all. I would expect such a document to tell me just how this is actually going to effect the environment and how you reached your conclusion to the effect.

Instead it simply appeared to be a "this is what we want to do and in our minds there will be a great outcome." Uh... yeah.....didn't they say that about Obamacare? Sorry couldn't resist.

I understand the goal of this paper was to be a summary and to adequately examine all the impacts would take way too many pages, but it didn't seem like a good job was done in summarizing the impacts, just a good job in summarizing the great ideas to be implemented.

Do you not agree this could be better titled? Am I nit picking? No, I don't think so. This paper/the plan was incredibly encompassing and sets the course for the next 20 years for pity sakes. Yet there were no real details. There were a lot of empty "maybe"s. It was way too nebulous to be of any use. was asking myself over and over - what do they really mean here? It certainly didn't wet my appetite to wade into the larger document.

Surely this was recognized before it was distributed. Why was it done?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2337    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 18:16:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Just so I'm not being all negative...the maps were very readable. Good job!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2338 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 18:30:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I object to all the plans the NPS proposed. I want there to be no change.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2339 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 18:35:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The NPS needs to leave things as they are. We don't need any new plan. I ask for no change.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2340 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 18:42:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am very concerned and disappointed in a few of the options in the General Management Plan that you are proposing for the Current River.

I live in S. W. Missouri but travel over to the Van Buren area to enjoy the Current River about 20-25 weekends a year. I have been enjoying that river for over 40 years since I was a young boy with my parents and now with my children, a weekend on the river is a wonderful and wholesome way to unwind from a stressful week, spend Quality time with family and friends and reflect on memories of previous times on the river some of those times you reflect on are times you had with loved ones that have now passed away (memories like that are priceless and I cherish them all, how would you like it if someone was considering taking away your access to the place that brings up so many of those memories). I was just about to make preparations to buy a house on the river over there and eventually retire there, but if one of the drastic plans are put into effect eliminating the use of anything over a 40 horse power motor (which won't even get a family of four over the shoals) or even boating at all, I have no desire to be in that area at all. I know dozens of people and have talked with at least 100 other people who feel the same way! I really don't know how many thousands of dollars a year I spend on goods and services in that area, but I suspect that you put one of the "Very Drastic Plans" into place the local economy in that area may never recover from the volume of business They Will Lose.

I can honestly say in all my years of boating and enjoying the river, I see no evidence of the water quality deteriorating, and with these newer Outboard Motors producing even less emissions than ever before, I have no reason to believe it will in the future either, as for what very little litter there is in the river it is created by floaters that have over turned or when the river floods, and 99.9% o it is picked up by us many boaters who take pride in the appearance and water quality of the Current River. I find it Very Sad that a group or two very over Zealous Environmentalists (who probably have never been on the river or even the desire to) have the amount of pull they seem to have. It must be because they have taken the time to go around to nursing homes and or assisted living facilities guilting older folks into taking what might be their last chance to do something positive for the world by signing the save the Current River Petition, making it look like they have a lot more support for their agenda than they genuinely have. I believe this because I met an employee at one of those facilities in the ST. Louis area who witnessed something to that affect. I'm sure you can feel my genuine love for and for the wellbeing of the Current River. Please Don't take away mine and many, many more families good quality wholesome fun now and for generations to come by implementing one of those drastic options. Of the three options, the only one I believe is user friendly is the "No Action" option and I truly believe the proper course of action.

Sincerely and Respectfully

Bill Reed and Family

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2341 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 18:50:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To Whom it may Concern:

I have enjoyed visits to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for more than 30 years. This is a unique and incredibly beautiful area that warrants strong protection from overuse and environmental degradation, while allowing access to the public.

I hope the National Parks Service will take action to protect this portion of our common heritage by strengthening the management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways through completion of a new General Management Plan.

One of the key issues that must be addressed is the expanding presence of motorized vehicles in the park. These should be kept to a minimum, as their presence in environmentally sensitive areas is doing serious harm.

Likewise, we need to restrict the areas that equestrians and their horses can utilize, not to keep horses out of the park entirely, but to minimize the harm they are doing currently.

I would also request that in developing a new management plan that the use of motorized boats be kept to a minimum and that the Parks Service will maintain existing motor-free zones and restrict, to the greatest extent possible, the horsepower of boats in areas where motorized craft are allowed.

I believe there should be a great emphasis on hiking in the park and that the existing system of hiking trails should be maintained and strengthened. I also support the designation of wilderness area to those locations where this is feasible, including the 3,430 acres near Big Spring recommended to be wilderness in Alternative B.

I would also be very supportive of programs to educate park visitors as to how they can enjoy their outdoor experience in nature while causing as little harm as possible to the web of life in this beautiful area.

Thank you for taking my concerns into account.

Sincerely,  
Mark Haim

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2342    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 18:53:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Ok, I think I'm finally done w/form. On to substance.....I've read through comment summaries from the local area. I noticed they were very pragmatic. It seems this area cares very much about the river. They aren't just grubbers trying to make a buck and it is wrong to characterize them that way. They seem to be just as concerned as you are about "environmental impact". And they seem to be very knowledgeable about specific things that need addressing.

They enumerated concerns that are easily addressed. I suggest rather than asking about a 20 year plan you start w/solving the very real problems in the areas they mentioned. There is some good local wisdom coming at you. I think if you would show yourselves interested in fixing some of this mess now, you would find open supportive ears on your 20 year plan.

Can you do this before you try and draft something so far reaching?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2343    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 19:02:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I adamantly oppose their proposal to appease environmentalists by limiting the public use and enjoyment of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. This proposal would hurt small businesses that rely on the riverways and keep the residents of Missouri from enjoying the rivers that belong to them. NO ACTION should be taken except to give the park back rightfully back to the people of Missouri.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2344    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 19:07:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We are not a grumpy people....but we do get riled when we see stupid ways of dealing w/stupid stuff that in reality has really simple solutions if just implemented.

You have generated a lot of bad feeling in these parts. That probably is an "impact" you might want to avoid because these are the very people willing and able to help you take care of the river.

Would you not admit you need them? They as a group have collectively watched these rivers roll by for much longer than any one of you have. It makes sense to do more than say "we will keep your concerns in mind".

You hear the same issues over and over again in their comments. Instead of a pie in the sky 20 year plan I would ask how you plan to address their concerns as soon as possible even before you do all the plan paperwork?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2345    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 19:11:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We are not a grumpy people....but we do get riled when we see stupid ways of dealing w/stupid stuff that in reality has really simple solutions if just implemented.

You have generated a lot of bad feeling in these parts. That probably is an "impact" you might want to avoid because these are the very people willing and able to help you take care of the river.

Would you not admit you need them? They as a group have collectively watched these rivers roll by for much longer than any one of you have. It makes sense to do more than say "we will keep your concerns in mind".

You hear the same issues over and over again in their comments. Instead of a pie in the sky 20 year plan I would ask how you plan to address their concerns as soon as possible even before you do all the plan paperwork?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2346    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 19:18:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Even though the comment "Camping on gravel bars would be allowed in designated campsites only" is under the "Land-based Recreation" heading, I am concerned that this could eventually include canoe camping. I am opposed to any restrictions on gravel bar camping by canoeists.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2347    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 19:20:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have camped, floated and fished on the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers since the year I was born - 1954. My parents first took me camping when I was less than one year old. Back then we camped on property owned by people my parents knew. You see my parents grew up in Eminence and graduated from Eminence High School. My grandfather Steve Hughes owned a sawmill in Eminence back in the 20's. The uncontrolled logging that took place one hundred years ago that fed his sawmill should remind us what can happen to the rivers if we don't keep strict controls in place. It was a travesty how the hills of Shannon County were stripped of all the trees without regard for the environment. My mother's maiden name Akers is still prominent on the Current River at Aker's Ferry. My point is that not everyone from Shannon County is in favor of Alternative C. I believe we need tighter controls on the number of canoes on the rivers, the size of the boat motors and limited access by ATVs and horses. For this reason I endorse Alternative A as the approach to manage the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on this very important topic.

Steven C. Hughes  
405 Courtney Estates Drive  
Fenton, MO 63026

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2348    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 19:22:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The first and foremost plan of action should be to restore/create your reputation in the

community as genuine care-takers of the rivers not just plan makers and rule makers. I think trying to move forward in this without that, is not wise.

You are developing the reputation of being out of touch because you are not fixing any of the real problems we see every day. You are also seen as an entity wanting to drive local residents off by endlessly increasing regulations. This isn't a local small town rumor....this is what state representatives also perceive.

You must be doing something real world present tense to get this rap. Can you tell me what that might be?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2349    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 19:34:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a long-time resident of Missouri I have great pride in our rivers and streams. One of my favorite laws in the state has been keeping the float streams open with the Navigable Riverways legislation. As a recreational whitewater kayaker and class II canoer, I have seen the downside of rivers that have seen the neglect and short-sightedness that is unfortunately characteristic of privately-owned land. Off the top of my head, the Ocoee and Pigeon Rivers in Tennessee and the Willamette River in Oregon represent classic cases of dead rivers that have been turned around through common-sense usage policies.

In regards to the Ocoee, I am sure the landowners threw fits about government intrusion when clean-up efforts were implemented years ago, but now the river is clean(er) and thriving and life is slowly return to the waters. And the same locals have reaped a lot of money from the paddling and tourist communities since the river has been better-managed. I seriously doubt that the area would have the influx of visitors if the Ocoee was still as dead as it used to be.

For the Ozark Scenic Riverways, I would hate to see the loss of regulations and returning the waters to an unregulated free-market. If those rivers were as unregulated as many other rivers (the lower Meramec in St. Louis, for example), the economy around those rivers would surely suffer as the water quality dropped lower and lower.

On the other hand, I do not think that Jet Boats and horse riders should be shut out completely. But then again, allowing unlimited free usage would have detrimental effects as well.

I've been cleaning sections of the Meramec for over 10 years with my local Clean Stream team and I've seen a remarkable difference in the amount of trash over the years. I attribute this to a combination of no-glass laws, stricter litter patrol, and public adduction and awareness. I think the same should hold true for the Scenic Rivers. Common-sense regulation and education does wonders for our society and the economies around the affected rivers. I don't think Eminence, Missouri, would fare so well if the Current and Jack's Fork rivers became trashed-out ditches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2350    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 19:44:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Park Service,

I have been visiting the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for nearly twenty years for camping, floating, and hiking. As a student, I spent two weeks on the Current River, floating from Mauntauk to Doniphan. As a volunteer, I helped construct the first trail from Cave Spring to Devil's Well. As an advocate for the Ozarks, I campaigned against the expansion of lead mining to the ONSR region. Through those visits and efforts I have learned about the Ozarks cultural history and ecology, appreciated the solitude of nature and escape from modern life, and developed skills for survival in the wilderness.

I appreciate the effort of the Park Service for putting together a thorough and well crafted management plan, something that has been sorely needed since I first started visiting the Ozarks. I believe both Alternative A and Alternative B will help solve some of the longstanding problems on the ONSR.

Of the alternatives, Alternative A is my preference. With urbanization, population growth, and global warming set to continue, the Riverways is vulnerable to further degradation. In order to preserve the Ozark Riverways for the future, they should be handled with the lightest human touch. Specifically, The Park Service's creation of the Big Spring Wilderness is commendable. Also, the added efforts of Alternative A to close horse trails, roads, and vehicle access to gravel bars will give the ONSR the protection it needs to continue to be a national treasure and pride of

Missouri.

I believe some of the potential uses presented in Alternative B and C are best suited for private land. I would rather see the private sector step forward to provide the more intensive and commercially oriented tourist opportunities. Again, thank you for your efforts.

Sarah Bantz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2351    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 19:47:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The current rules governing the Ozark National Scenic Riverway work quite well. It would be a shame to restrict a wonderful use of our state's outdoors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2352    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 19:52:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I was a little girl when the Park Service took my parent's land. So over the last fifty years I have watched how the park service has managed the Current River and Jack's Fork Rivers. Cemeteries and buildings that are important to the people who lived here for years have been allowed to torn down or rot down and not had any upkeep. Cemeteries have grown up and tomb stones knocked over. Those buildings that are still standing should be repaired so people can enjoy them. Some example are the cabins at Pulltite Springs, Maggard cabin across at Welch's Spring, lodge at Welch's Spring, and Akers Church( Mt. Zion) I am sure there must be more down the river. People who have roots in this part of the country want to come back and enjoy ruminates of their past. The only Alternative, "No Action," is clearly the choice while stepping up to the plate to preserve the culture, traditions and heritage of the area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2353    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 19:54:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I feel that the government took too much land along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. They don't have the man power or funds to take care of what they have. As a result they shutdown campgrounds, roads and river accesses, trails and caves. Examples are the campgrounds at Akers, and Powder mill, Jerk tail landing, Sinking creek, Cedar grove, and Round Spring Caverns. Alternative "NO Action" with reinstating of previous camp grounds is the only viable alternative and reinstates the infrastructure from the previous legislature.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2354    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 19:56:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Over the last fifty years, I have watched small thriving communities dwindle due to the change of the economy brought on by the Park Service. Examples are Cedar Grove, Akers, Round Spring, Two Rivers, and Powdermill. Now right before my very eyes the same thing is happening to the city of Eminence. The only alternative "NO ACTION" is the clear choice and reinstate recreation and all activities as proposed by the original legislation of 1964.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2355    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 20:00:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft General Management Plan.

---

I have canoed both the Current and Jack's Fork numerous times over the past 15 or so years, mainly camping overnight on gravel bars.

In general, I support Alternative A for the more primitive experience it would allow.

Some more specific comments about the plan are:

- The plan should be more clear that gravel bar camping by river travellers would be unrestricted.
- The plan needs to specify that scenic easements will be protected. If not, under what circumstances would they not be protected?
- All three alternatives allow for the possibility of bike trails. If bike trails are to be built, they should be kept separate from existing hiking trails.
- All three plans talk about completing a "cultural affiliation landscape plan" that would increase areas managed as meadows and agricultural sites. If this entails clearing areas that have become reforested, it sounds like a bad idea. There are plenty of float streams in Missouri where one can pass through pastures. There are numerous bird species that require a continuous canopy of trees. Would more agricultural sites cause more siltation of the river? What possible purpose could this serve?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2356    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 20:00:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There are many beautiful places along the rivers where walking trails can be made so people can visit and enjoy the springs. Some places where walking trails can be built are, Welch's Spring, Cave Spring, Arlie Lewis place (a beautiful spring is on this property) It was an ancient Indian campground. Any other springs on the rivers that this would be feasible can be added to this list. Walking trails need to be established and maintained. Alternatives need to be written to provide walking trails so the public can enjoy the crown jewels of Shannon County and Carter County.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2357    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 20:01:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for the incredible depth and breadth of this draft plan. Alternatives are clearly spelled out and underlying information and impacts presented in extraordinary detail.

#### ALTERNATIVE A

As a non-motorized watercraft user (canoe and kayak) I favor ALTERNATIVE A that provides the greatest scope for this activity on the river. The sound of motorboats and the level of their disturbance of wildlife materially decreases my enjoyment of the relatively unspoiled river environment. Limitation of unauthorized horse trails & crossings is another valuable feature of Alternative A as it will help preserve water clarity, permitting observation of aquatic species and also reduce microbial contamination that limits swimming/snorkeling activity. I would like to see less restriction of camping on gravel bars not directly accessible from the land by road or trail. Alternative A's reduction of overall river traffic during peak season & weekends is also very desirable. While I recognize that implementation of the relatively more restrictive requirements of Alternative A will require an increased enforcement presence for some period of time, I hope that it will not be heavy-handed and will focus only on behaviors that either directly violate new management regulations, or are abusive or disruptive to river users whose goal is a pleasant natural experience. Thank you. ALTERNATIVE A

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2358    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 20:01:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** So many of us from Illinois have enjoyed experimenting these scenic rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2359    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 20:03:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Your description of the Ozark culture under the primary interpretive themes makes us sound like a tribal culture. I do believe you are missing some important aspects of who we are, to say the least. I wonder what would happen if we were to include a section in there of the NPS culture written from our perspective....I would gladly volunteer to do so....complete with plenty of local colloquialisms (wry smile).

Seriously, it says a good deal about what you believe our role is here. My question is what do you believe, in your



ideal world, if we would indeed step up to the plate, the role of the local community here in the riverways?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2360 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 20:03:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Horse trails need to be established and maintained from one end of the river to the other. In the pioneer days, there were horse trails up and down both rivers. There is not alternative that supports recreation as proposed by the enabling legislation of 1964. Horse trails need to be included.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2361 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 20:05:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** A study needs to be made to figure out what places people are taking their nature breaks up and down the rivers. Then comfort stations need to be conveniently built at these locations. Alternatives need to be written that will provide the needs for the public.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2362 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 20:10:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern

I am in favor of Alternative A and urge you to choose A to benefit Missourians and visitors to our state for generations to come.

This area is for everyone. We can't all live near it but we would like it to be preserved for when we are able to visit. This area is rare and beautiful and should remain so.

I would also be in favor of choosing Alternative B but would not agree with any other choice.

This issue requires thinking "for the greater good".

Thank you for allowing me to have input on what I consider to be a matter of importance to the citizens of Missouri,

K. Ballard

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2363 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 20:12:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I want to thank the National Park Service for their efforts to protect the Current and Jacks for Rivers. I support Alternative A because I strongly believe in putting the environmental concerns first, it would not only benefit the rivers but the communities around it.

The Current and Jacks Fork Rivers were chosen to become part of the national park system fifty years ago, and because it was, families like mine have been making a connections to nature, history, culture, each other and our country ever since. Personally I attribute, the rivers, to whom my brother Mark and I have become. Visiting the rivers since early childhood has given us a respect for nature and a desire to travel.

Pulltite Spring is no doubt one of our favorite places, and we have spent a lot of my time looking for something better, visiting national parks all over the country. It has always concerned me that we don't get the same feeling in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, as we do in other national parks; a true wild experience, a super welcoming atmosphere, and the feeling that the number one priority is protecting the specific national treasure.

If the park service is forced into a No Action plan, I hope the park service will still enforce the original rules of the park, by closing illegal access points and keeping horses and motorized vehicles where they belong.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2364    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 20:20:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I had a local say to me the following: The NPS isn't about maintaining the parks they do not do that. They simply sit around and make up rules and plans that restrict park usage in numerous ways....closing roads/trails/restricting motors etc. All they want to do is limit the use of the parks period. They don't enforce laws. They don't maintain waterways. They are not good stewards of the timber. They say they have no money/no staff they are able to spare to do that.

This characterization seems to me to present a problem. No wonder the perception is the govt. just wants to buy land and then run people off it. They have no interest in making it a good place to recreate because they have no money to implement anything like that. I really didn't have any good answer for him being told myself "sorry we don't have the manpower" to do this or that.

It doesn't cost much (except time and paper and yes that cost a whole lot more than I'd like to imagine...it seems we pay a good deal to people for them to just sit around and make regulations/rules/laws) to make rules restricting usage. Make the rules, write up and post the rules, make the barricades and signs and you are done. A lot easier than mowing, dealing w/gravel, drunken boaters etc.

What would you say to this person to change their perception? I ask this question because most people are viewing this plan in the same way....nothing but a bunch of new restrictions, who needs that? I have to admit in thumbing through that looked about to be the size of it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2365    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 20:23:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would request the new management plan restrict motorized boating to the greatest extent possible. Missouri has numerous lakes and rivers for motor boating, so I see no need for them in this otherwise wild and scenic stretch of riverways in a national park. Their presense destroys the natural ambiance, and the motors are often so loud that you can even here them a ways away from the rivers - for example when hiking to Blue Spring. If motor boats are to be permitted within the parks at all, please impose strict limits on the areas they're permitted and their speed and horse power so as to minimize their impact.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2366    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 20:25:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would prefer motorized boats not be allowed at all. I believe they create both water and noise pollution. I visit these rivers for the solitude and the fishing and the pure beauty. I understand that others have a different reason and different ways of enjoying the rivers - but I would really like to have motor boats very restricted if at all.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2367    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 20:28:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** After a brief review of the extensive documents presented I am overwhelmed with the amount of information available for the review process. Because of the extent of scientific data and broad range of social implications I must admit that I am not qualified to make any definitive observations regarding which if any of the plans might be the best route for the future of our Riverways.

As a longtime lover of the river however, I believe I am very qualified and obligated to express my concerns and in doing so urge you as our chosen representatives to do what is best. Best for the rivers, and best for those who love and respect it most. Not what is best for those who abuse, plunder or ignore the responsibility that comes with such a gift in our midst.

It seems to me that after watching how a pristine waterway can be abused in the interest of commercialization and how families, fisherman, equestrians and other lovers of natural things can be pushed to the side by men's quest for selfish causes, it's time that we stand up for what is right.

The party crowd will loudly push themselves into every corner of every beautiful place we have because their "rights" allow them to do so. To our shame, places like "party cove" on the Lake of the Ozarks and the drug traffic on the Elk river in SW Missouri are near comparisons to what has occurred on our very own Current and Jack's Fork rivers under the NPS watch. Shame on the leadership of the NPS for sitting on their hands while families found themselves without a park because it had been taken over by drunkenness and vulgar behavior. The power to correct these problems is already in the hands of those in charge.

Now it seems like the answer being promoted isn't to enforce laws and guidelines that are already on the books, but rather to restrict the use of roads and gravel bars by limiting access through a heavy hand.

I would urge you, clean up the problems by enforcing the laws. If overuse is scientifically damaging our river, then it is the NPS responsibility to limit use in order to maintain the quality of the waterway and the visitors experience. But first, correct the problems of drugs, alcohol and nudity that make the river unusable to our families. The basic indicator for the success of a great park system is whether or not an average American family can go and enjoy the best experience possible in a natural, safe environment and then go home safely with great memories that will keep them wanting to return. We have failed in our obligation to families, but this is an opportunity to correct that mistake. Let's not get sidetracked into political battles of wilderness designations or closing all access thinking that we are helping their cause. To do so would be simply taking public land and building a wall around it to keep everyone out so no one can misuse-or even lay eyes on-some of the most beautiful places that make our park special.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2368    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 20:31:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a life long resident of Shannon County I have grown up on the river ways. From camping and fishing with my grand parents. To taking my own family canoeing and boating today. My grand father was the former head of the park until the mid 1980's. He taught me how to enjoy and love the river. Please consider no change in park regulations moving forward. As the principal of Eminence High School we would appreciate more park employees to protect and enforce the regulations that are already in place. Which would help preserve the park, as well as bring in more jobs to our communities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2369    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 20:41:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** These Ozark inhabitants deserve and need our protection.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2370    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 20:42:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We favor Plan A as the best approach to preventing the degradation of this precious resource. What should be a concern to everyone who values these rivers is that they are suffering from overuse in the warm months of the year. Eventually this is going to cause the decline of tourism in the watersheds, which will certainly affect the local populations who depend on the income from tourism. Locals who complain about federal interference are ignoring the many benefits that the National Scenic Riverways program has created for their section of the state.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2371    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 20:47:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to endorse Alternative B. I love and appreciate our national parks and wish to see ONSR shine as an example of what a park can be. To be something that all Missourians are proud of.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2372    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 20:48:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am strongly in favor of plan A to preserve this magnificent piece of nature for our future. The number of people that have "discovered" this river for recreation has exploded in the past 20 years or so, which underscores the dire need to protect it. If it is not protected this area will be lost to us all, depriving everyone of it's irreplaceable beauty and economic benefits. Every pristine piece of nature needs protection. This boosts the local

economy as evidenced by our great national parks where rules governing driving, camping, etc are strictly enforced. We all accept and understand the need for these rules, and the Ozark National Scenic Riverways deserves no less from us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2373    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 20:50:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Of the plans, I support the no action plan. I am opposed to the other plans as they do very little to improve the park overall. Basically, the primary component of all of those plans is restricting access to the park, not a tangible plan for better management.

The management style I would prefer would be for the decisions and plans for park management be left in the hands of the local people as they have an inherently more accurate understanding of what needs to be done because they live there and observe it often, not for just a study for a new management plan. They also have a vested interest in proper management because they use it on a daily basis and in some cases depend on it for their livelihood something which the NPS does not have.

The biggest problem on the riverways is the reprobate activity. In order to improve visitor experience in the park, rather than enforcing a wide breadth of regulations, NPS needs to spend their time enforcing common laws such as no littering, no public intoxication etc. - laws that you would find in any town or city or where people gather. The NPS needs to be dealing with genuine criminal behavior before it takes on minor infractions such as horsepower of motors etc.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2374    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 20:52:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No Action!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2375    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 20:56:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the no action plan, things are just fine the way they are. There is no need to change the way it is currently being managed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2376    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 20:58:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am strongly in favor of Plan A. Resources like these rivers must be protected for future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2377    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:01:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a Nurse Practitioner and disagree with proposed changes to the primitive camping. I have patients who are unable to walk to primitive camp sites for physical reasons. It is discrimination against people with disabilities to restrict their access to campsites which have been enjoyed for years. I advocate no change in the primitive sites accessible by vehicles. It is essential for their access which is only fair option. Even closing some roads to primitive campsites is not an option because people with disabilities may not have the funds to travel to other locations. Why is there a problem with these accesses anyway?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2378    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:01:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alternative B.

It is crucial to protect and restore important ecosystem features in the ONSR while providing a balance of diverse

recreational opportunities, restore miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduce gravel bars designated for vehicle access, provide a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park, and strengthen monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

The ONSR is a natural treasure for Missouri and the nation. It should be protected and managed for current and future generations to experience. Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2379 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:05:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I was born and raised near the Jacks Fork and Current River, my family has lived here over one hundred and fifty years. We have seen many changes through the years, and very few of them have been for the better. My great grandfather provided a living for his family for many years hauling gravel out of the Jacks Fork River. Now the river is so filled in with gravel you can walk across in several places that were once good fishing holes. I have countless fond memories of time spent with family and friends swimming, floating, fishing, and gigging on the Jacks Fork and Current River. My family and I have enjoyed numerous fish fries from fish taken by the aid of boats and motors that, depending on the location on the river, would be greatly restricted and/or made impossible under this new proposal. It greatly angers me that the new management proposal options given by the NPS cater to special interest groups and place great restrictions on the way we have enjoyed our natural resources through the years. In twenty years, I want to be able to enjoy spending time on the river with my children and family the same way I have done. I do not want to see the river accesses and places our family has had the liberty and freedom to use and enjoy for the last century closed, limited, or restricted in any further manner. I support the "no new action" management plan to preserve our way of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2380 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:07:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the changes to change primitive roads to hiking trails. Removing 10 miles of roads in primitive zones and replacing them with hiking trails. There is no reason hiking cannot occur on primitive roads without denying access to those who are not able to hike. The park belongs to all Americans, well, ill, old and young. This place has a lot of history and it is wrong to prevent the elderly and disabled from access to the places they are used to accessing and sharing with their grandchildren. Please do not close down any additional roads.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2381 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:12:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please No Action!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2382 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:13:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am opposed to closure of any horse trails in the park. Requiring a permit is unreasonable. The impact of horse riding has been exaggerated. The Alternative B is very vague in intent to what improvements it will have but specific about the limitations. Manure is fertilizer, not pollution. In addition the horse riding is a viable necessary source of income to one of the poorest counties in Missouri. This source of income is essential to the needs of local ferries, grocery stores, various shops, gas stations, restaurants, motels, etc. There is little alternative options for this long standing way of life.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2383 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:15:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for considering the protection of the Current River. Among the many, many rivers I have paddled in my life, the Current River is one of my all-time favorites for its diverse flora and fauna and the spectacular quality of the water from the spring discharge.

I naturally want to encourage limits on motor boat horsepower and favor plan A. The motor boats affect the

ecosystem and adversely affect the enjoyment of the non-motorboat visitor. The boats cause significant noise pollution and a wake that erodes the shoreline plus exhaust that lingers above the water long after the boat is out of sight. There are so many other places in Missouri to take a motor boat so as to not sacrifice this very special natural resource.

Again, thank you for offering this opportunity for my comments.  
Joe Sartori

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2384    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:19:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the regulation of horse trails and requirement for use of permits. Horse back riding is what Eminence is known for all over the state. People travel from all over the country to participate in horseback riding activities in our area. It provides increased tax income and local jobs in perhaps the poorest county in Missouri. There are already limited opportunities in this area. More restrictions will drive away tourism and limit our source of revenue.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2385    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:22:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am from Iowa and canoe the OSNR at least twice a year. Because of the drunk and rowdy crowd on the Current River during summer weekends I now mostly limit my visits to the OSNR to before Memorial Day and after Labor Day. I canoe both the Current and Jacks Fork rivers, but have not paddled the Jacks Fork below Eminence for years because of the pollution caused by e coli from horses. I would also point out that it takes me about eight hours each way to get to the OSNR, and that I spend a considerable amount of money on each trip for food, supplies, restaurants, and motels both in Eminence and Salem. I am also a frequent user of the campground at Pulltite and camp on Current River gravel bars on multi-day down river canoe trips.

I am writing in support of Alternative A of the Draft GMP. I believe Alternative A provides the best compromise between multiple use of the OSNR and the Park Service's duty under the OSNR enabling statute:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of conserving and interpreting unique scenic and other natural values and objects of historic interest, including preservation of portions of the Current River and the Jacks Fork River in Missouri as free-flowing streams, preservation of springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources thereof by the people of the United States " PUBLIC LAW 88-492-AUG. 27, 1964

I believe that Alternative A is better at meeting "the purpose of conserving and interpreting unique scenic and other natural values including preservation of portions of the Current River and Jacks Fork River " I would also point out that this refers to the condition of the rivers as they existed upon enactment of the legislation, not to the currently existing conditions after years of extensive overuse as a result of inadequate enforcement. This is especially true as relates to destruction of the riverways resulting from unauthorized roads, horse trails, ATV usage, (including, but not limited to unauthorized river crossings by horses, vehicles, and ATV's) and vehicle and RV camping along the rivers' gravel bars.

At a minimum I also support Alternative A regarding motor boat and motorboat horsepower limits, especially on the upper stretches of the Current and Jacks Fork rivers as explained in table 4. I would also strongly recommend that the plan not allow motorboats above Two River either in peak season or off-peak season. If motorboats are to be allowed between Round Spring and Two River during the off-peak season, I recommend that their horsepower be limited to no greater than 10hp. I have personally experienced dangerous encounters with higher horsepower motorboats on the Current River between Round Spring and Two Rivers. At least three of these incidents occurred in October between Bee Bluff and Two Rivers. In one of these incidents the motor boat barely avoided crashing into one of our canoes as we were heading downriver through a narrow channel.

While my wife and I own two horses and participate in trail rides, I strongly support Alternative A regarding horse usage as described in table 13 provided that restricting horses to only designated trails is strictly enforced. The

overuse of the OSNR by horseback riders has caused at least as much, if not more, degradation of the riverways and river water quality as has vehicle use. The stream bank erosion and e coli infestation (especially on the Jacks Fork below Eminence) are prime examples of this problem that is best addressed by Alternative A.

I would also like the new GMP to make it clear that gravel bar camping by people using canoes, kayaks, or other paddle craft not be further restricted. I agree with the statement on gravel bar access in alternative A as stated in table 13: "Vehicular access to all gravel bars would be eliminated. Gravel bar access would be by boat or walk-in only."

However I am deeply opposed to the statement on gravel bar camping in table 13: "Camping on gravel bars would be allowed in designated campsites only." In discussions I have seen in the press and on the web, this statement is not being interpreted by Park Service staff as restricting gravel bar camping by canoeists, kayakers, other paddle craft users, or hikers. I would like the GMP to clearly state it will not restrict gravel bar camping by canoeists, kayakers, other paddle craft users, or hikers, but that it will also prohibit gravel bar camping by horseback riders, vehicle, RV, and ATV users.

Finally I would like to point out that Park Service is to manage the OSNR for the "use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources thereof by the people of the United States." (PUBLIC LAW 88-492-AUG. 27, 1964). This means ALL the people of the United States, and not only, or primarily, those who live within proximity to the OSNR. The people of the United States, including its elected officials in Congress and the President recognized this when the legislation creating the OSNR was enacted in to law. That is just, if not more so, true today than it was then; despite what some "locals" and local Members of Congress would like people to believe.

Thank you for considering this citizen's comments. I trust you will see the wisdom of incorporating them in the new OSNR General Management Plan.

Victor Elias  
1325 Badger Creek Road  
Van Meter, Iowa 50261

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2386	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 21:22:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of option A. Most important to me is restoring and then conserving the natural and cultural resources for future generations, and not just park users. I think the long term economic health of the community depends on developing a more diverse mix of uses, for example, higher quality back country experiences, while maintaining a resource that continues to be appealing to visitors.

While the local community may have a strong sense of ownership of the park lands, they have not paid property taxes on it, or paid for improvements that make the natural and cultural amenities easily accessible. They have enjoyed this property, as I have, for free, thanks to the taxes paid by people in other parts of the nation as well as by them.

I heard about this document from multiple sources, including but not limited to the NPS.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2387	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 21:24:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I've been following the ONSR management plan chatter for quite a while, having read most of the articles available on line as well the follow-up comments. I also read most of the Draft General Management Plan, and I submit the following in reaction.

But first, I'd like to mention that while I live in St. Louis, I have a unique perspective concerning the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. One of my grandmothers was from Arcadia Valley, one grandfather was a long time property owner just off Highway 19 south of Salem, we own property along Ottery Creek not far from the OSNR, and I spent many days of my youth canoeing the Current River.

Additionally in the past year alone, I canoed parts of the Gasconade, Little Piney, Black, Huzzah, Courtios, Meramec, Current, and Jacks Fork Rivers. As a matter of fact, I spent five days on the Jacks Fork and six days on the Current. I also hiked near the Current on the Ozark Trail from Peck Ranch Mill, and did a trail maintenance weekend on the Big Creek, which flows immediately into the Current.

I have always considered this region and these two rivers very special. This area of Missouri is very wild and scenic, and we owe it to ourselves and to our children to keep it as pristine as possible.

But there's no doubt in my mind that our love for these two rivers has caused problems due to over use. In my lifetime alone, starting in the late 1960's until now, I have seen all of the following:

â€ ATV's and trucks in the riverbeds.

â€ Trucks parked and camping on the gravel bars.

â€ Dozens of illegal access points.

â€ An ever increasing number of power lines over the rivers.

â€ MODot's absurdly excessive Highway 17 Bridge over the Jacks Fork.

â€ Way too many canoes on the river at one time (summer weekends).

â€ People using chainsaws along the river (that they unloaded from their canoe).

â€ Excessive trash.

â€ People driving right into our canoe campsite at night from one of the aforementioned illegal access points.

â€ Jet boats excessively driving up and down the rivers (one actually fished a long rapid by driving their boat to the top of the rapid and drift fishing on the way back down...over and over again).

None of these I would consider scenic, which was the original purpose of protecting these rivers in the first place. It really saddens me when people seemingly want to ignore common courtesy (and sometimes the law), and do as they please, wherever they please.

The Current and Jacks Fork Rivers are truly gems, and along with the Eleven Point, are the only protected rivers in the state. I've seen firsthand, what happens when the rivers aren't protected. All of those items listed above plus development along the rivers are commonplace. (Speaking of the Eleven Point, we haven't canoed that river in years because of all the boat traffic below Highway 19. This was a regular destination all through the '80's and '90's until the boat traffic got out of control.)

Several opinions have been offered that those people who live along the rivers are the true guardians of the rivers, that the lands used to create this park were 'taken' by the government, and some feel it's their right use the rivers anyway they see fit. I can sympathize a little, but it's been 50 years since the park was created, so quite frankly, it's time everyone realize that this is national park, to be protected and used by all the people of the United States.

Therefore, in an effort to keep these rivers as scenic as possible, I would to offer Alternative A as the best option. There is no doubt in my mind that this option would be best for these rivers.

Jack Waterbury

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2388    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:24:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** First of all I want to thank the National Park Service for putting together a well done and thoughtful analysis. However, I would like you to adopt Alternative A. I have enjoyed this area for many years, hope to for many years to come. I think it would be helpful to have pit toilets along the river, as many people do not know how to dispose of their waste properly. I would also like wilderness status designation for Big Spring.

All the best,

John Markovitz



---

**Correspondence ID:** 2389    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:25:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It is important for everyone who values the Current River work together. Lack of any management has meant the River is beginning to rapidly decline. That degradation will continue if no one allows change to occur. Option B is an approach that incorporates use of the river not only for protection but also allows all those who use the river to become better stewards of a unique river system. It will require accountability and cooperation by everyone, elements that are currently absence. Option B for management of the Current River could become a model for other states to use as they plan management plans for their river systems.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2390    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:25:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My first float trip was on the Current River when a teenager about 1980. I loved it and like to go floating whenever I can which for the last 30 some years has been once a year with only a few exceptions. For several years, my adult brothers and our children camped and floated a river together each summer. We floated several different rivers in Missouri's Ozarks. In 2011 and 2012, my son (aged 17 and 18) and I rented kayaks and floated the upper section of the Current River. I was pleasantly surprised that it was the best experience I have ever had floating a river. The reasons were: A) There were very few other people floating which contributed to us seeing wildlife and being able to truly relax and go at our own slow pace. We saw several birds, including a black crowned night heron (and got to sneak up for a close view). While I am not an avid birder, I really enjoyed that experience of seeing this rare species of bird for the first time and watching it for a matter of several minutes. The visitors we did see were using the river appropriately - not just drinking and partying like on some rivers. B) Not to be taken for granted - the crystal clear cool water is very important to enjoying the river. We don't just float on top, we like to stop and swim. My favorite thing to do is: park the kayak, lie in the water on my stomach with my life jacket and goggles on, float a section with my head in the water (holding my breath) and watching the color and movements of the fish. C) We enjoy the challenge of negotiating the curves which is why we prefer the upper sections of rivers. I vote for management option B and want to emphasize that I think your top priority is to protect the ecology and water quality of the rivers and lands of the Ozark National Scenic Riverway. Doing so will also protect the quality of experience of floating the river. Concerns in regard to water quality include: protecting the land where the water (and potential pollution) comes from and impacts of people riding horseback or driving ATVs. Another ecological concern is control of invasive species. I would suggest placing a port potty at strategic locations along the river and let users know of those locations so that a significant amount of the human waste can be collected rather than deposited in close proximity to the river.

In 2011, we visited Devil's Well and thoroughly enjoyed being at the base of the sinkhole with the lights on which enabled us to see just how far down the water was falling before landing in the underground lake. It was very impressive, cool on a hot summer's day and relaxing to watch and listen to. I was disappointed in 2012 to find that it was closed. I hope that by now you have opened it again with the opportunity for an experience similar to what we experienced in 2011.

We hope to visit Devil's Well again and kayak the upper stretch of the Current River again this summer. I look forward to it all year long. Thank you for your management of the ONSR. Oh, and I think management of the ONSR should continue to be by the National Park Service.

Roxie Campbell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2391    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:28:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose reducing the number of gravel bars accessible to vehicles. My granny is 86 and has lived in Shannon county all her life. It is not fair to limit her access to the river because she is not able to hike or travel in a boat. This is discrimination against the ill, elderly, families with young children and babies, limiting the number of gravel bars or eliminating them will impose a hardship or impossibility for access for them. I oppose any rule that would limit our access to the gravel bars by vehicle access.

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2392    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:32:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I think we should adopt the NO-ACTION alternative. I like the way the current system works and would not like to see any restrictions to public use of the rivers and camping areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2393    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:33:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a 15 year old kayaker who loves to go on float trips on the current river. last time I was there, I enjoyed the beautiful scenery and clear stream. I noticed the erosion on the side of the riverbank that was caused by motor boats. this was disturbing to me. if we don't take care of the river, in years to come the erosion will start to have a greater effect on the river. This will make it muddy and unpleasant for anyone to enjoy. I am asking you to restrain the motor boats as much as possible. Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Danielle

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2394    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:39:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Lets keep the Current river peaceful by banning motorized boats and reduce the air pollution from the motor boats from this gorgeous natural area.

I would like to enjoy this beautiful place without having to deal with motor boats speeding by and disturbing the peace.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2395    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:40:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose closing road and increasing law enforcement to increase compliance. It does not make sense to spend more money (law enforcement) to decrease use of our parks and access points. The plan insinuates there is ample federal money for use to fix something that is not broken when our federal government shouts their financial distress. This is ridiculous use of tax money. Leave the roads and management as is.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2396    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:44:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a citizen of Texas County in Missouri concerned about the effects of the Draft General Management Plan on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers area. Closing access points to the rivers will seriously impact the tourism industry in the area. The people of Missouri have maintained the health of the rivers and surrounding areas for a long time. I understand why people from other parts of the country enjoy our Ozark scenery and culture but I deeply resent them trying to make changes to our part of the country. I strongly urge the National Park Service to take the no action alternative to prevent more restrictions on public lands, protect private property rights and protect our local tourism industry and economy. I believe an even better action would be to transfer ownership of the land to the State of Missouri.

I believe my comments are substantive and I would appreciate a response. If you think they are not, please tell me why not and how you can ignore them.

Respectfully,  
Bill R. Reece

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2397    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:44:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent:

I would like to comment on the proposed GMP for the Ozarks National Scenic Riverways. I appreciate your efforts to come up with a plan that takes into account many styles of recreation while showing serious concern for improving environmental protection.

I believe that Alternative B is the most realistic and beneficial at this time. I very much like the idea of the protecting our fragile Ozarks by your proposal of several actions: 1) closing undesignated horse trails and restoring them to natural condition while designating legal ones for equestrians to use. Likewise, 2) closing undesignated roads while adding or keeping limited others. And 3) limiting access points and stream crossings.

Human beings tend to overuse, abuse, leave trash behind, etc. The abuse of our fragile ecosystems are proof of this as shown by the degradation of our gravel bars, access points, and erosion which harms native plants and animals and open our lands up even more to invasive plants which then causes a vicious and sad spiraling down of our natural ecosystems.

I would definitely support including the 3,400 acres near Big Spring to be managed as wilderness. Wildlife needs a safe place to live and raise their young. How much better is a wilderness area for some of our shy birds and animals - plus, for young people to experience a true wilderness!

The proposed visitor and learning center at Powder Mill will be beneficial. Our young people, who will be the future stewards of our lands, can only really learn what they are taught and, best of all, can learn firsthand. They will love expanded museum and archival experiences as well as enjoying the natural treasures of our rivers, springs, and woodlands. Experiences without motorboat noise, ugly erosion from horses and vehicles outside their designated areas, etc., will be invaluable to give our young people peaceful, exciting times that may spark a love of nature and scientific curiosity for a lifetime. I hope many grow up to love our native fish and flowers and birds and animals as much as I do.

The extra staff positions that will be required can only be beneficial for education and oversight.

Thank you for attempting to take another big step forward in managing for generations to come our beautiful national lands.

Judy Bergmann  
6450 Cedar Lake Dr.  
Bonne Terre, MO 63628

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2398    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:45:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** i really dont like when moter boats speed by on the curent river. it disturbs the peace and quite when you wanted to get out of the city to go some where quite. when i am there, i always like to see the wildlife, and i am sure that all the animals would also like for it to be quite too, and the fish don't like the the spinning blades and also there is lots of polution from the stinky boats. And the poulution can harm the fish and i always like to look at the minnows and then darters and one time i found a smallmouth bass and that was the only one that i have ever found. If the boats keep coming i wont be able to find another one. and that was a very cool experience. i would appreciate if there were no more moter boats on the river please.

Josh (age 13)

P.S I speak for the fish

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2399    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:47:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the alternative B limitation on motor boats northern boundary to Pulltite during off peak season. What reason is there to stop the long standing culture of gigging in this community? People have been gigging in the current river for longer than I have lived here. When I moved here 23 years ago I fell in love with the culture and rich history of the area. I have no intentions of changing this culture just because I did not grow up that way. There have been enough changes and restrictions to the way of life here in the past 23 years I have lived here. Motor boats especially off season should continue to be allowed and motorboats during peak season should be allowed from Pulltite to Round Spring. There is a small community left in the area that depends on these activities to make a living here. The activities is why we live here. There is limited alternative financial resources, limited money

for gas to travel down river to locate another spot for gigging etc as well. I find it very hard to believe motorboats are causing any significant problem to change the culture and traditions of the local communities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2400    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:48:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No action.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2401    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:52:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for your work on the revised alternatives for the General Management Plan for Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

I am a native Missourian and have enjoyed the Current and Jacks Forks rivers since the 1960s. My experiences exploring and enjoying the river and area communities were important in development of my overall appreciation of our natural world and our place in it.

The ONSR is a beautiful area appreciated by many. To continue to enjoy it and preserve the area for future generations, we do need to consider some limitations on our own activities. I think the NPS draft management plan has done a good job of presenting alternatives which consider variations on how to manage to enjoy and preserve the ONSR.

I recommend that that alternative A would provide the best protection, balanced with many opportunities to recreate in the park.

Of most concern to me are the many unauthorized access points to the river and motorized access to gravel bars. Also there are many unauthorized trails and old roads which aggravate unauthorized ATV traffic. Also of concern is the excessive number of trail riders and unauthorized horse riding trails. I support horseback riding in ONSR but think the current amount of unauthorized trails and large number of riders are putting unacceptable pressure on water quality and other natural resources in the park.

I also support the recommendation of a Wilderness area in the Big Springs tract.

Thank you for consideration of my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2402    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:54:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose restricting the motorboat use on the Jacks Fork river. There is already extremely limited amounts of time when the river levels are high enough to run a motor boat above West Eminence. However it is unfair to restrict access to the river by boat. You should be able to make a round trip boat ride up and down the river when it is deep enough to travel. Paddling up the river is not a likely options for most people I know. Please do not change the motorboat limits currently in place.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2403    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 22:08:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPS,

I have been on this river since before I could walk. I have swam, fished, hunted, drove my boat, and camped on this river since I can remember. My family has been here doing these activities before I can remember. My wives grandmother grew up on the river and had to move from the river when the park was created. The reason for these people to be moved away from the river was to protect the river from over exploitation and to protect the resources. As a result, my wife's family and my family were raised at the headwaters of this beautiful river, specifically big creek. The reason for the national park service to designate these rivers as a national park was for preservation of resources and to allow access to the rivers. I have a few issues I would like to address about the proposed

management plans and my experience with the current management plan.

First to give a little background on myself, I grew up on a tributary of the Current River, Big Creek that flows into the current above Brushy Creek and Bee Bluff. After graduating from Bunker High School I went to Missouri State University and received a B.S. in Wildlife Conservation and Management with a minor in Agronomy. I now work for a state natural management agency. I can say that growing up on this river and then being educated on habitat sustainability and ecology that I can see degradation. I can also say that the degradation I have witnessed isn't from boat traffic, "illegal access" use, or atv abuse. The degradation I see is from uninterrupted floater "tourist" traffic. The people who use the river every week take care of the river every week as they use it. As part of my job I float the upper current from Cedar Grover to Akers and the amount of beer cans and trash in the river is 4:1 compared to below Round Springs where my group of users take care of pollution whether it is theirs or not. The amount of trash on the upper river that is comprised of tourist and "environmentalists" and pails in comparison to the amount on the lower river where local heritage takes care of its grandparents back yard!

One of the key proponents of all the management plans is that the river is over used and abused. Superintendent Bill Black said in an interview after one of the public hearings that it is hard for the people that are here all the time to see the damage caused by use of the river. That is a paraphrased quote but I would have to disagree with Mr. Black's quote. Mr. Black is like a lot of park users who come in once a year, or in his case get out of their office every 6 months and think they see something different. To restrict the smallest group of river users with boaters and horse riders and leave unrestricted numbers of canoes throughout the river system makes little common sense unless the national park services seeks money from tourists and concessionaires. If the problem with them river is over use then why target the smallest group of users to fix the problem? Common sense should answer this question, but the proposed management plans exhibit little common sense! This river has cared for its self for hundreds of years through floods and natural ecosystem interactions. The wake from a boat, or the tracks of a truck pulling a camper onto a gravel bar 100 yards from the river will do no damage to the ecosystem and a flood event will wash the river whatever way it is naturally going to. Natural ecology that is stated in the establishment of the ONSR cites overharvest of timber, the effects of that are just now being shown, not the effects of current river users!

The proposed management plans other than the "NO CHANGE" alternative will do no better at managing or preserving the river than the current plan. The rules that are already in place are not enforced and I place sole responsibility on the National Park Service to enforce the rules and regulations they already have in place, before placing more regulations and excluding responsible users from the river because of the National Park Service's negligence of the rules you all have empowered previously. Enforcement of the current park rules are more than sufficient to preserve and allow access to this national treasure.

While the park is a national treasure and is open to everyone, I believe that the current management plan is more than sufficient to preserve the park's visitors and local constituents. If the current rules were enforced with concessionaires numbers, horse numbers, river rules, and access rules, the current management plan would be more than sufficient to meet the needs of all park users. Excluding certain groups from certain areas with designated camp sites, horsepower limits, road closures, and access closures does nothing but showcase the National Park Service's unworthiness to enforce its own rules and regulations within NPS boundaries. If the NPS would enforce its own rules and do its job set forth by the National Scenic Riverways act through congress there would be no need for a discussion on new rules and regulations to discriminate against its constituents, their visitation rights, and their heritage rights. Regularly placed park rangers every weekend within every 5 river miles would pay volumes to the current river management. In my 20 remembering years on the river I have only saw ONSR rangers 10 times on the river, and that is in about 100 times on this river. Enforcement would pay volumes and if these rangers enforced the rules set by the CFR Title..... that gives them authority, 99% of park problems would be curtailed before the environmentalist pressure that is pushing this current management plan would be null and void!

If the NPS feels necessary to enforce new rules and regulations look at the enforcement of the current rules and regulations, local economy affected, local heritage that will be killed by new regulations, and the outright slap in the face to the people that live and work around the ONSR borders with the newly proposed regulations. If the NPS would do their job in protecting our grandparents home places there would be no angst towards the NPS but rather an embrace from a next generation that will enjoy our heritage left by our forefathers. Instead, embrace the local heritage, work with local groups and government, and enforce the rules you have empowered upon us instead of catering to environmental non local groups that want to not be disturbed by locals on their weekend get aways. We

embrace tourism, we want people to come here,... but we don't want people to call for us to be kicked out of our back yard and the NPS to cater to these groups from big city and big money lobby groups to enforce their will over our local heritage and our back yards.

A few suggestion I will give for a new management plan besides the NO ACTION plan I support is No concessionaires floatables below pulltite, and no boats above year round. A clear list of "unauthorized or illegal" roads and reasons of why these roads should be closed, both political and scientific! Just because it takes forever and a day to get there doesn't mean they should be closed, a federal budget is large and gas is no big deal for enforcement! And a reasonable option to vote and show local voice on these options that affect us most. For no reason should Kirkwood and St. Louis determine the course of our back yard for their once a year enjoyment. We live with a national treasure in our back yard but the fact that it was our grandparents front yard should hold some clout in the decision that we get to use it with something besides camping in a commercialized campground, canoeing in a concessionaires canoe, and hiking on a designated trail lighted and concreted! The National Park Service has done a poor at best job of managing the land and the fact that the NPS should cater to both local heritage and tourists who are lucky enough to experience our back yard by striking an educated and informed balance instead of a government iron hand approach. In my opinion the NPS should turn over the ONSR to the state control which manage the resources with better oversight than the NPS.

My plea is choose a NO ACTION alternative and give the plan 20 years enforcing the rules the way the NPS is supposed to instead of catering to liberal environmentalist groups from hours away that with to hamper local way of life and way of making a living. If you are a low paid intern reading this to make a recommendation to the staffer who pays you, think about where you played as a kid and someone taking that away instead of some dumb redneck making a plea to take a boat ride :). Thank You and have a good day and hope to see you some day on the river.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2404	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 22:20:32				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I have floated the Current River several times with my family over the last thirty years, and in the early years I have greatly valued this experience. I have been distressed to read of the pollution of the waters by horse-back riding and all-terrain-vehicles. I appreciate the work that the NPS has done in analyzing the need for improvements in its management plan. Alternative B would be an improvement over the present situation, but I urge that Alternative A should be adopted, including closing illegal roads and restoring natural conditions, closing undesignated horse trails and limiting stream crossings, and barring vehicle access to gravel bars. I also advocate that Big Spring be designated for wilderness status.

In the coming decades of drought and more extreme weather variations that climate disruption is bringing, our ecosystems and scenic areas will be severely stressed. We will continue to need services from our ecosystems like water filtration and carbon regulation. Our Midwest culture will be better inspired to respect and maintain our ecosystems if our citizens can experience a healthy, non-degraded ecosystem like ONSR's. It's important to preserve the full ecological diversity of our treasured areas like the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, to keep them robust, capable of survival, and influential. All of this requires that our national park tracts like the ONSR must be protected from human use that degrades their soil integrity, water purity, and scenic integrity.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2405	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 22:21:57				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I think Plan B represents the best balance for all the users of the Ozark Riverways. Plan A is the next best choice by restricting overusage.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2406	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 22:24:58				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I prefer Alternative Plan A because it promotes the most natural, scenic and peaceful experience of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I like Plan A for its reduction of motorized boat traffic, management of horse trails, elimination of vehicle access to gravel bars and recommendation of the majority of the Big Spring Wilderness Study Area to have Wilderness status. However if Plan A was not possible, I would consider

Plan B to be the next best alternative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2407    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 23:11:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the most protection for this riverway and it's flora and fauna. Restriction of anything that causes destruction as such should be forbidden.

"The more clearly we can focus our attention on the wonders and realities of the universe about us, the less taste we shall have for destruction."

â€ Rachel Carson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2408    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 23:38:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This plan must have taken a long time and much money to prepare. It is over 500 pages long. I think the public should have more time to hear about this and comment. It affects many people, who may not have had the opportunity to hear about it. Many of these people use these areas for recreation or for their livelihood. There should have been more time than 3 winter months to comment. There were only about 3 meeting dates also. This was too small a number, because many people use these areas but do not live there. The rivers should belong to the people not the government. I only heard about this plan tonight. February 6, 2014 and have not had time to read it. It is also not in a convenient form to read. PDF is too hard to read. I think that, if it is a good plan, then there should be a fair amount of time for the people to know and comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2409    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 23:56:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Comment on the draft GMP

Having been told that Alternative B is a 'done deal', I would like to request these tweaks:

That the NPS come up with a procedure of permits or exceptions to allow persons who, by reason of age, or physical impairment must use motorized forms of transportation to access the river, historic or natural sites of interest, old roads going to family homesteads and cemeteries and other places on a case by case basis, using the least intrusive means of transportation possible. No more than one permit for one individual (and caregivers if needed) shall be issued in any 6 month period, and the party needs to pick up the permit in person from one of the park offices or one of the concessioner's stores, so that their impairment, or age can be verified by sight or by the same means as one obtains handicapped vehicle plates. Misuse of such permit or falsification of impairment will be grounds for no more permits being issued to that party.

That the wording of permitted gravel bar camping be made more clear that it includes people floating the river, or hiking in, and that barriers erected against vehicular traffic be constructed in such a way to allow passage of wheelchairs.

In regards to motorized use of the Jacks Fork above Bay Creek and the Current River above Pulltite:

That the Plan be amended to allow motorized access to these rivers from September 15 to January 31st inclusive during gigging season, as long as the individuals, or one adult family member of a group putting in has a valid Missouri fishing licenses and are engaged in that activity under current motor horsepower limits. I would further permit motorized fishing from January 31st until September 15 with current motor hp limits from 4 p.m. Sunday to 10 a.m. Thursday of all weeks, excluding Memorial Day, 4th of July when it falls within that range of days, and

Labor Day. On those holidays motorized boats would be excluded from the rivers from 9:30 a.m. until 3:30 p.m.

While occasional use of a motorized boat on plane would be permitted, "joyriding" or repeated racing on those sections would be prohibited.

That the Park Service continue to cooperate with Stream Teams, other paddling groups, equestrian companies and trail rider groups, an environmental groups, and others to promote joint stewardship opportunities, stream cleanups, volunteer labor projects and encourage such groups to adopt sections of stream, acreage, trails, caves, campgrounds, springs and other places of natural or historic significance, working together with NPS to keep the park in good condition.

That the park take advantage of August 25-26-27, the birthdays of the Park Service and Riverways, and National Public Lands Day a month later, to foster publicity and public service to the park resources.

That the management of the park look closely at the next twenty years through the glasses of balanced carrying capacity of the areas and activities so that everyone may experience all the park has to offer over their lifetime, but perhaps not everything all at the same time,

That the park be instructed to establish a Citizens Advisory Committee, consisting of park stakeholder groups and at least three ordinary citizens, one from within the park counties, one from at least 100 miles from the park, and one non-Missouri resident to offer ongoing comment and oversight of park operations. The Committee would be non-voting, but the park would be instructed to pay heed to the opinions of this committee. Such committee would meet in person once a year and conduct most business via email and telephone. The Committee would be charged with representing the varied interests of the public to the park. No member of the committee could be a public office-holder at the time of service, no one could serve for more than 4 years, and terms of service should be staggered.

The very first sentence of the enabling legislation says, in part: "...For the purpose of conserving and interpreting unique scenic and cultural values—including preservation of springs and caves—and provisions for the use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources thereof by the people of the United States"

The park, in my opinion, has been derelict in this by increasingly putting the springs and caves off-limits to the people. At this time, all the park caves are closed to human recreational visitation, to minimize the spread of a fungal disease which has never been shown to have been spread cave to cave by humans, but which HAS BEEN SHOWN to spread PRIMARILY BAT TO BAT, and notwithstanding the US Fish and Wildlife Service has established guidelines for human visitation to caves to mitigate even the accidental spread of this fungus.

I would like the park to make Powder Mill Spring accessible again. This is NOT the cave—the spring which has grown up in swamp near the old building.

That was such a cool place until about 15 years ago. Why did you guys let it go? I'd like to get around to more of the 50 backcountry springs— Giving them a higher profile would help increase adventure in the park. Maybe tie it to geocaching. The park is plenty big. You need to spread the people out more thinly and give them access to more than just the river. That would help solve the river's problems, too.

I'm still not happy with the non-access at Round Spring basin. If you can't touch the water, it's not a visit. Astonishingly enough, with traffic directed to the outlet of the tunnel, lots of people get to the tunnel area, and never continue up and around to see the real wonder. What a shame.

I call on the NPS to re-establish wild and show cave visitation in the park, under the US Fish and Wildlife guidelines of their decontamination protocol, with human access restored from April 15 to October 15 as soon as a practically possible. While bats are most certainly interesting creatures, the primary directive of the enabling legislation also means to preserve and research the subterranean rock and water ecosystems; this cannot happen due to the current management practices. Letting people into the caves during spring summer and fall will have absolutely no deleterious effects on the bats. I want back into the caves before I'm too old to go!

I also call on the park to re-open Round Spring Cave for educational tours to the general public during the same time



period. We've got to keep inspiring the kids to follow after us, and if they have no caves to visit, it becomes more and more difficult.

Finally the park is tasked with preserving the culture of the Ozark people, but for 50 years, it has done a pretty poor job in doing so. It has never recreated the success of first few years (1972-75), when the park was run by NPS staff, and the summer programs were presented by locals who merely had to be themselves to entertain and instruct the public. We realize that Ozark and NPS culture clashes, but there is something lost when someone down from Chicago for the summer tries to interpret hill culture that they barely have been exposed to. At one time, fifty years ago, there might have been something to the fact that locals weren't the most educated; but that's not entirely true; many of those local seasonals for the summer of 1973 were schoolteachers from the area. There are plenty of local people who are much better suited to interpreting the local culture. If you must hire seasonals, let them do science, and geography and direct the visitors with maps and to the bathrooms and leave locals tell about the local history and culture, and why living in the hills is different than in the city.

The Haunting in the Hills is a good step in the cultural direction, but even there professional interpreters outnumber people who still do the crafts for fun and leisure. Get folks from the Christianson craft camp to help out. You really ought to not pay them to demo, but do allow them to sell what they make. Last year's Haunting, a make-do affair that was on and off, was more authentic than the one put on by the park. Use people from the local history museums for programs. Talk with Melanie Carden-Jessen at Twin Pines—she's always got some local history thing going—making stuff not just listening. Let people try things at the haunting. You do such a good job with kids, but adults are just big kids, too. I think last fall's haunting had two good storytellers, two that were awful (you couldn't hear them) and one that was irrelevant (not Ozark) You need more locals telling more of the local history...how about Libby Sanders? How about a series of locals as evening programs or a history weekend?

There really needs to be a concerted effort to work with the townsfolk to get more authentic cultural interpretation at the park. My most precious memories are of Art Patterson, and Edna Staples, and Swiney Rayfield—these people were the real deal, as are the local musicians. Mitch Jayne was down there so long he went native, There likely are people yet living that can help out, and not charge \$200 a day to be an Ozarker. They are some of the people who commented to turn the park back to the state. Let them tell their family stories about what the coming of the park did to their lives...too many of them will be gone too soon.

No mountain bikes. Those things make worse ruts than horses. Continue to permit rock climbing and bouldering. Let people get out there at their own risk and not get arrested. Work out and sell a short, more lay oriented "Homeland and a Hinterland" park book. Figure out a way to sell the park as 7 days a week, not just a drunken Saturday experience.

An entrance fee won't work at this park, but you need some way for the people who come there to make money donations that will stay at the park for improvements, for program materials, for all the niceties that a little spare cash could arrange. Not donations to the federal government in DC. If it goes to the park and stays with the park and they know it, a lot of people would make donations.

Continue to permit everything, but no excesses on anything. That is your best road to go. Get a handle on actually how many horses and how many private boats use the park in a year. If it takes a \$5/year bridle clip or sticker for a boat, like they do in the boundary waters, so be it.

Anyway, those are my suggestions and rants. Carry on.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2410	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 00:11:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a former resident of Missouri I floated the Riverways for many years. I support the NPS alternative B. I feel that the Riverways are best protected by this alternative and offers a balanced mix of uses while providing increased non motorized areas for quiet enjoyment.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2411	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 00:16:02				

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Take no action on the proposed Plan!

Stop closing the old roads and trails. The Great American Outdoors initiative should mandate that all roads should be opened back up to access the National Park Service Ozark National Scenic Riverways at their original access points.

This would open the river up so all its beauty and splendor can be accessed and enjoyed as it was in the 1950s as stated in the original NPS plan, where the county roads would be maintained and the upper Current would get a primitive campsite. We are still waiting!

Upper Current - the river of my heritage:

Interpretation needs to be done along and marked about the Civil War trail in and alongside the Current River from Chilton Mill in Shannon County to TanVat to almost the head of Current River at Montauk State Park. Panels should be along the river telling about the troop movement in the Civil War. Also, interpretation panels placed at the parking area where the troops left Current River and headed North on a creek bed three miles where the Union troops encountered Confederate Soldiers who were camped at Inman Hollow where 11 Confederate Soldiers were killed in the Skirmish at Inman Hollow in August 1882, within a mile of my and my Dad's birth. The Union troops returned to the road and headed on north toward Salem where a Skirmish at Salem had taken a few days before in July 1862, not to be mistaken for the Battle of Salem that took place December 3, 1861.

This is a cultural resource location, in the Current River at this location at TanVat many local people were baptized in the river years, from churches that I attended as a child, the Upper Parker Community Church located four (4) miles east of TanVat and Mount Olive Baptist Church, located four (4) miles west of TanVat that I have attended the past 20 years. Other cultural locations where I have witnessed baptisms as a child and a young person were at TanVat, up-river from Cedar Grove and at Cedar Grove, Akers, and Sinking Creek at Current River.

The Hickman Mill was the earliest Mill in the Upper Current, dating as far back as 1835 that developed Montauk as a community. Other mills followed, one mill was owned by my Mother's great uncle.

Tan Vat and its importance to the development of Montauk, MO. (Mother was born four miles West of Montauk and it was the Post Office of her birth and Dad and I were born almost four miles East.)

The Historic trail - the road in and out of the river was where my Dad drove in our 1937 log truck from lower Parker down to Cedar Grove that overlaps the Civil War Trail in the river.

Commerce and Industry: The timber and lumber industry was active along the river. The timber men who were tie-hackers floated railroad ties and logs down the river. My dad and his dad were tie hackers.

Agriculture has also been lost on the river starting with the Eli Cook, the Cooks farm at Lower Parker, 'Aunt' Susie Nichols farm. I hear it has had some improvements but like all the other hoses along the river if you wait long enough it too will be lost to the NPS irresponsibility in the Upper Current.

When I was very small, In the summertime on weekends we would go to places like Lower Parker or Parker Ford and picnic in the afternoon putting in a watermelon in the river to cool. Mom would make lemonade and cool it in the river water. We would taste the water cress and fry the fish. I would catch minnows using a gallon jug, screen wire and soda crackers. My dad and brother would be fishing.

Dad would take me gigging for eel in the Current River in what is now called Baptist. That was not my favorite sport.

In the Thirties, Dad went to the Lower Parker School House and there people would make mattresses.

There was a tomato canning factory in the Jadwin, Cedar Grove area in the Thirties and two of my Dad's sisters worked at the cannery.

My Family along the river: My Mother's Great Uncle owned the Eli Cook farm and sold it to buy land and develop the hamlet at Cedar Grove where at one time there were three doctors. My great aunt worked for one of the doctor. Just before Eli Cook's farm and across the river, my Dad's grandfather owned the farm near Allred rural school.

My Dad's cousin owned a farm near the Lower Parker rural school.

My dad great Uncle owned Schafer Spring area. My Dad's, Dad, married a Prince, a Cherokee Indian, who was a descendent of the owners of Prince Spring.

I have no family at Akers, but I road the school bus with two Maggard boys who family owned and operated the ferry. I crossed the ferry many times on my way to see my Dad's cousin who was a Prince descendent.

My Dad and my three brothers built the upper dam at Alton Box Board.

I worked at the original Camp Zoe, when it was a children camp to pay my way to the university. We would walk up the confluence of the creek and river to cool off in the Current in the hot summer time.

My Mother's grandparents and two daughters lived near the Current River at Eminence.

William Ashley, Missouri's first Lt. Governor, played a role in developing Montauk and the TanVat area. He had a

trading post at Beaver Creek about 35 miles West of TanVat and was told he had another one at TanVat where they tanned hides and established a tannery. He mined the saltpeter out of Ashley Cave about four miles up-creek from Montauk State Park on land that my Mother's grandfather and grandmother owned where she was a fortune teller. Ashley hauled the saltpeter back through this area to his munitions plant in Potosi in the early 1800.

Copyrighted 2014 Deloris Gray Wood, president of both the Dent County Historical Society, and Trail of Tears Missouri chapter

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2412    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:53:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for taking the time to analyze and research this issue so carefully. Your recommendation of Alternative B is very much welcome, but I feel we could go further with Alternative A. Within 50 ft. of roads should be restored to a natural state. Horse traffic should be limited, as well as stream crossings. Also, RV access to the gravel bars should be hindered.

If this plan is instituted, Americans will enjoy this land for years to come through preservation of the ecosystem.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2413    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 01:08:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In my life I have canoed and kayaked many times summer and winter on the Current River. I have also swam and canoed the Jacks Fork River several times. These rivers have a unique quality and special beauty. Especially the Current River is so clear or was in the past before it was degraded. After a weekend it becomes more cloudy. But in later years it was degraded by misuse and abuse.

It is not respectful to allow human trafficking of horses and dogs on all the roads and gravel bars on the river. Human traffic with horses causes a manure problem. It also detracts from the beauty and solitude of the river experience.

These rivers belong to everyone because of their special qualities and therefore should not be squandered to use as any one group to take for their own. Instead, the rivers should be protected for everyone to enjoy in a respectful way. Respectful means to respect all life in and around the rivers. Respect the fish, the frogs the Ozark Hellbender salamanders, respect the springs fragile beauty and ecosystems- -all the springs should be protected with wilderness status including Big Springs. It has been my special experience to have healed my frozen shoulder by swimming in the water by and sunning on Pulltite Gravel Bar. I have spent many quiet and thoughtful moments in the summer and winter at the Current River. It is my hope that all the wildlife in the area will be protected and not hunted. The beaver should not be trapped or shot. The rivers should be left in their wild state for all to enjoy. Please choose Alternative A or at least B to protect the rivers.

Please close illegal roads and restores natural conditions to 50 miles of these roads, please close 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and add no new stream crossings.

I think it is unsightly to allow vehicle access to most gravel bars. However there is one gravel bar beneath a bridge which has been used as long as i have been to the river as a camping area. It has park toilets on site. This gravel bar should be maintained as in the past years and allow camping on site. The rest however, should be barred from traffic other than boaters or hikers.

Please protect the rivers for all of us to enjoy and for all life to breath and live.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2414    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 02:59:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** They are flowing sewers. Too many people, all using them to defecate or urinate. I floated these rivers in the late 70's, they were very enjoyable. I recently floated two of them, and will never again. Everyone drunk, acting like idiots.

I married a woman from Cook Station, her brothers and I liked to gig for suckers. We will not eat the fish from these rivers until they are free from urine and feces.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2415    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 04:13:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Our rights for the river should remain what they are. This is why I live in the area so I can enjoy our beautiful rivers!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2416 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 04:52:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a former Missouri resident, I strongly support Alternative B as the model for the management plan covering the Ozark Scenic National Riverways. This river system is simply too beautiful and important to risk further degradation by the overuse in localized areas. It needs to be well managed in a balanced manner. The National Parks system certainly has the historical track record to prove that they can adequately handle the task. Also, the proposals to turn this management over to the state need to be carefully considered. Although local control may sound attractive, state management would undoubtedly be more vulnerable to and responsive to big-money commercial interests. It is really not a reasonable option on which to risk the state's most wonderful natural asset.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2417 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 05:33:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Mountain biking should be permitted in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The low environmental impact of mountain biking is an activity that should be allowed in the park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2418 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 05:49:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

Cycling at any level has been proven to reduce many of today's health issues associated with inactivity. Giving more access will only bring more of us to your state for recreation. If you did not know, mtb bikers/cyclists are the people on the ground maintaining the trails Missouri already has. This will give me more reason to recreate in Missouri

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2419 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 05:52:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

Allowing Mountain biking on the trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Mountain biking would bring tourism and needed tourism money to the area. Mountain biking advocacy groups would also provide better trail maintenance as well as modern sustainable trail techniques to the trail system.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2420 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 06:01:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Current and Jacks Fork Rivers of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways are amongst the most pristine riverways in the world. Being from the St. Louis area, I've always driven past multiple Ozark streams to get to the Current and Jacks Fork. This has never bothered me but actually, without a doubt, been completely worth it. Watching cars pull off I-44, heading toward the Meramec, Huzzah, and Big Piney always puts a smile on

my face, knowing I'm only about half way to our little gem. Putting in on the Current makes you feel like you are in nature.... Even in peak season, there are only a few others floating, most of whom are like minded to myself...making it feel so wild. Fishing for Trout and Smallmouth Bass while gazing up at towering bluffs, listening to the chatter of the Kingfisher as it swoops past our canoe. At night pulling onto a beach knowing we're in the wilderness. Dark, quiet, a seemingly perfect campsite. Pitching our tent under a giant sycamore that seems to be reaching for the stars. This is where I feel the most at home.

In the past few years these quiet, dark, wild experiences are becoming harder to come by. In picking out a beach camp on these multi-day floats the criteria used to be simple - high enough over the water to keep from being flooded out and checking the map to ensure we are far from roads giving us that quiet seclusion we are looking for. But in the past few years that has changed. Now we simply look for a beach that's not covered with tire tracks. Even on beaches far from roads I've recently had four wheelers pull into my camp in the middle of the night.

Although I've backpacked all over the world, visited numerous National Parks and climbed some of the highest peaks in America, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is still my favorite place on earth. I look forward to exploring the new trail system and have high hopes that we can do something about the illegal roads being created in the park, keeping it the wild place I grew up in. We all want this place to remain special so let's all work together to make sure this happens.

I support plan A and B. More importantly I think whatever plan goes to action IT NEEDS TO BE BETTER ENFORCED. Like previously mentioned it almost been run over in the middle of the night by a pack of four wheel drive vehicles deep in the backcountry on the current river and that completely unacceptable.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2421	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 06:02:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I support mountain biking in the Ozarks biway. Allowing the health and low environmental impact sports like mountain biking will increase public health and tourism. More and more communities are embracing the inclusion of cycling as a firm if transportation and exercise.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2422	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 06:02:37				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** As a 35 year employee of Ozark National Scenic Riverways I feel the need to express my opinions regarding the GMP. I have worked as a reservation clerk, a fee collector, a park technician, and as a L.E. Ranger. I have seen Superintendent Art Sullivan's "management by neglect" style when rangers were asking for guidance and got none. And I have seen few managers who would make a decision. I have seen lack of direction and an increasing lack of communication with not only the community but also with staff. I have seen articles in the paper about the park and complaint letters to the editor that were far from accurate and I saw no response from the park what so ever. It has always frustrated me that inaccurate information that was reported and not challenged by the park. When this happens, the public that reads it, feels it must be true. If every complaint I have heard against the park were accurate, I too would truly believe that Ozark National Scenic Riverways was a disgrace.

May times I have wanted to stand up to the mud slingers and challenge the press to print the truth. I, however, am not the public information officer, and I know my place. So I work quietly, kindly, doing my job and only speak individually to people who question me about issues. I seek to educate anyone with an interest in "my" park. There have been many complaints over the years. Drug and alcohol use contribute to, or caused most of them. I was pleased to see press releases about our "crack down on bad behavior" being issued 5 or 6 years ago. Putting that in the papers had the desired effect, for a while. Ranger continued to do the same job that we had always been trying to do, but people were more aware that bad behavior would have negative consequences. The "bus greeters" contacting the park visitors at the put in points, reminded them that rangers would be watching for "bad behavior". Then reports of bad behavior began to drop.

Still, few park visitors know that public intoxication is a crime. Because we deal with thousands of visitors on any given Saturday, rangers must choose to contact only the drunks who are creating a disturbance, or endangering themselves or others. We cannot remove every drunk. Where would we take them and how would we get them there? There is no holding facility big enough, nor are there enough access points along the river to bus out all of the

drunks. It would require a road paralleling the river and a ranger shuttle bus to pick up and remove drunks before they spoil the day of other visitors.

An issue that I would like to discuss is ROADS. The shuttle bus removal was a joke many of us shared over the years, but the road paralleling the river was a true need. On the upper part of the Current River from Parker Ford to Akers Ferry they used to be a "river road" that rangers used to patrol on. It was the way the land owners accessed the river and forded the river to reach their farms. These roads were generally not open to the public until after the park took over ownership. When the land was in private ownership, only landowners and their friends used the roads.

Almost all of them had gates that were kept closed. These friends had a rare treat to be allowed private access to various backcountry parts of the river for hunting, fishing, boating and camping.

Then, Rangers used the road to patrol the river and to contact floaters in case of emergency. Early rangers continued the idea of a "river road" by blazing a trail between Akers Ferry and Round Spring that they patrolled on horseback. Former park ranger Darrell Blackwell told me about cutting out the brush along the trail in the spring before canoe season really got going each year. This allowed the ranger to watch groups and perhaps follow a suspect group down the river. More importantly it allowed the ranger to be seen often by floaters. This was important because the upper river is not always easily patrolled by boat due to shallow water. The Lower Current rangers had the "tram road" that they used in the same way.

I said that there used to be a "river road" because this became a problem

1. The road was never maintained and became a 4 wheel drive road only.
2. More people began driving 4 wheel drive trucks which increased the use to these areas
3. The road got worse
4. The road then attracted "mudder trucks" looking for Off-road experience. Large numbers of trucks, jeeps, etc. began fording the river and driving the river road as their recreation
5. As the road got worse, good people made bypasses around the worst-deepest mud holes in order to get to their favorite fishing hole. ATVs and mudder trucks then used those mud holes as play grounds.
6. People who saw the mess of mud holes and bypasses spread, thought that we did not care about our park if we let that happen. If we don't care about the land, why should they?
7. The Big Creek crossing into the Ozro Riley tract was closed to keep the ATVs and mudder trucks in check.
8. Vehicle traveling the river road between Parker Ford and Cedargrove often damage their undercarriage, running boards, etc. because the road is in such horrible condition.
9. Emergency vehicles (ambulance & fire) including rangers, can no longer get to most of the backcountry areas accessed by the river road, except on foot.

Rangers reported a large increase in use of the river road by visitors with 4 wheel drive trucks. These people asked if they could ford the river like they had seen the rangers do. When asked for guidance on this issue we were told that if it was an established crossing then it would be ok. Rangers did not want to see so many vehicles in the water, but did not want the river road closed for patrolling purposes. We requested that the river road be occasionally graded and parking provided at the access points. We also asked that the river crossings should remain open for ranger use only.

When the park's roads were mapped and the Roads and Trails plan published in 1990 it did not designate the crossings as "Service road". Management had not listened to their own staff. Instead the plan listed the river road and many others simply as "unmaintained" with the hope that they would fade away. Some did, but not many.

In 1990 the Shannon County commissioners objected to the designation of 3 or 4 of the roads in the Roads and Trail Plan. I do not recall Dent or Texas County commissioners objecting to any road designations. I do not work in Carter County so I did not pay attention to any objections that they might have had. A few people told me that old logging traces were roads, because they wanted to use them when hunting. I noted that there were other roads that had either been missed when the mapping was done, or had already been in such bad shape that they were not getting much use, and thus not counted. 15 years ago, ranger Bill McKinney and I submitted a proposal to revise the Roads & Trail management by closing the fords to the public (gate to create service roads) upgrade the river road conditions and create parking areas at the river access points. This would satisfy the complaints of the new generation that wanted more access (since they had been using the backcountry for fishing and hunting) and would protect the river from indiscriminate vehicle use.

I began educating people about the damage a vehicle can do to the river such as multiple pollutants (transmission & brake fluid, oil, antifreeze from the engine compartment), and macroinvertebrate compaction by tires. I used a stream

table to demonstrate.

As the years passed the amount of jeep and ATV use grew. Jeep users will go where ever they see an old skidder path left over from logging, an ATV trail, or a road in disrepair. Since ATVs are supposed to be Off-road vehicles, many riders feel free to make their own paths. Rangers had to get ATVs in order to intercept ATV riders. The state of Missouri passed ATV regulations allowing ATVs on county roads, and the park had many county roads inside our boundary. We asked for guidance about ATVs operating in the park. We got none. I felt that they were not a licensed vehicle and thus not allow on park roads. I began telling ATV operator that the only place they could legally be was a county road, and that most roads in the park were NOT county roads. I printed up a copy of the regulations and began educating the public about the state regulations. Now the county commissioners began claiming almost all the roads in the park as county roads. Former District Ranger Bill Terry told ATV operators that as long as they had all the required safety equipment, they could ride in the park.

The road issue will not go away. Not maintaining a road does not end the road. But it ends respect for the road and the road's owner. If you want a road closed, have the spine enough to close it right. Otherwise maintain the road. I know we do not have enough grader operators to keep all the roads up annually, but once every 3 or 4 years would have made a big difference in the river road. I occasionally patrol the river road between Cedargrove and Parker Ford and it has not been maintained for 50 years or more.

Another issue that I would like to comment on is the HORSEPOWER limitations and no motor zones. I met and married a local man after coming to the Ozarks. My father in-law ran the Dairy Isle in Eminence. Prior to purchasing the restaurant he worked for Bales Boating as a river guide and commissary cook. He told me that everyone used to run 25 hp motor (with a lift) on their boats. With the advent of jet units and later jet motors he bought a 40 hp motor. It was much easier on his arthritic shoulders that operating the lift. Because the restaurant was open 7 days a week, my husband used his dad's boat more than he did. We kept it at our house most of the time. It got used for fishing trip and boat rides, but by Labor Day each year it was equipped with a hand rail and lights. Opening day of gigging season was the social event of the year. Everyone would gather at their favorite river access point and build a bonfire. Multiple boats would launch and beach. Chairs and buckets would hold friends reconnecting in a thanksgiving like pilgrimage. Some would day gig like my father in-law and husband, but most would wait for dark and begin gigging for everyone's supper. Potatoes, hushpuppies, biscuits, and onions would be fried on the gravel bar. Coleslaw and beans would be brought out and served along with the fish.

As a ranger I worked the gigging season rather than recreated. I would observe that the 5 or 6 regular boats I would see in the summer at Akers area would be replaced by up to 30 different boats from Salem, Houston, Bunker, Licking and Rolla. They didn't all come at once. Usually 2 or 3 boats at a time. Sometimes a lone boat would be seen. The further down the river you go the more boats you see, because it take skill to operate a boat on the upper reaches of the river. The first two weeks of gigging season would be the most active, but gigging light can be seen most fall and winter evenings on the river.

Sometimes groups go on fishing trips, but usually a fishing trip is one or two people in a boat or canoe. This is reminiscent of the original settlers of the Ozarks fishing for their supper. Because of the swift current it is difficult to paddle up stream, therefore the need for the motor on a stable flat bottomed fishing boat. These are not speed boats for lake riding, but some speed is necessary to get the boat up on plane in order to get over the shallow water shoals.

The 1984 GMP made at 25 HP limit above Round Spring and a seasonal 10 hp limit above Akers Ferry. Because we did not enjoy the river much below Round Spring, we returned my father in-laws boat to Eminence and bought a small boat and 9.8 hp motor to fish near Akers. The motor would not go upstream. In the end we sold the boat/motor because we could not use it to go upstream. If we were just going to float, we could use our canoe. Because of the motor restrictions, we found ourselves going fishing only once per year or less after the 1984 GMP.

The current GMP mentions the 60/40 motor controversy. It also has zones with no motors. I believe that the ideal hp ratings would be everywhere above Round Spring as a 25hp jet, and everything below Round Spring listed as the 60/40 motor. The river will limit the use above Pulltite to those who can run a boat well. If you need a motor free zone, use Cedargrove as the boundary. Gigging is not allowed there by the state already so it is not much to blame the park for. Besides few boats operate there now.

Instead of no motor zones, I would like to see, or rather hear a noise level restriction on the motors. My parent home was on Boone Lake in East Tennessee. Until the TVA instituted noise restriction on motors, the boats disturbed us at all hours of the day and night. Noise restriction helped tremendously.

I know that there are people (including me) who do not like to hear a motor boat when they are trying to get away for solitude on the river. I never liked operating the park's Jon boat because of the noise. But there is no solitude on Saturdays anyway. Rather than a motor free zone, I would like to see set days that are motor free. I enjoy kayaking on Tuesdays when there is no crowd. I raised my children on the river those days. Even then we could not escape the noise of airplanes since we are in the major flyway for the airliners. And many places you can here vehicle traffic on a highway. That is the nature of a linear park.

Those people who want solitude should not come on the weekend and expect to find it. And those people should remember that the Jon boats were here on the rivers first. It is not fair to punish the few boaters who live and recreate on the upper parts of the rivers just because it is easier to make that stretch motor free. To make motor free zone in the headwater may affect less people than down river, but we recreate where we do because we prefer those areas. I could have taken our boat and fished at Two Rivers, but I don't like that part of the river. I like the headwaters. And so do the 2 dozen boats that I see on the river above Pulltite regularly. But you will hear from the 100 rare boat operators who still want the option to go above Pulltite. This is just going to feed the anti-government sentiment that already exists in Dent and Shannon counties. Perhaps this is a remnant of the Highlander whiskey rebellion since these are the ancestors of the Ozark settlers. Many moonshiners lived and plied their craft in these hills and still do.

I would also like to comment about the proposed Powdermill Education /Visitor Center. If the plan is to use the old Owls Bend School to develop an educational center to bring school students to for field trips I fully support it. MDC does similar things at Twin Pines and WE should be doing this. If however, the plan is to revise the visitor center at Powdermill that the cave researcher are currently using, I would like to respectfully say "Been there. Done that. Didn't work" A couple of lovely local ladies used to work that visitor center for us and had very few visitors to talk too. The building floods. The location is wrong. It did not work the last time we thought, build it and they will come. Put resources into the areas when people are. We used to have a wonderful blacksmith at Powdermill who could also tell a good story, and even he had limited success and drawing visitors.

This park needs to cater to the type of visitor that we want. Families & seniors, not the party crown 18-30 year old. We need more electric sites. We need more educational programs. We need more hiking/biking trails. We need more frequent campfire programs, with real campfires. We need more sing alongs around the fires. We need more approachable rangers (le and interp) on foot in the campgrounds. We need more adventures for families. Fishing clinics, archery, night hikes, Scavenger hunts, and competitions. Bass pro type stuff - outdoor cooking class. We need to have a booth space at all the RV shows in the state.

Another issue is horses. This is easy. Designate trails that are not on ARPA sites or eroding sensitive area. Close duplicate trails. Limit river crossings and get the horse rider involved in policing the trash. There are horse groups that specialize in trail construction. Get them to help. I would also suggest an annual horseback rider permit that hangs on a lanyard. This (suggested \$20.00-25.00)user fee would help sign and print maps of the designated trails. It might also fund a mounted ranger program. We don't need horse camps since there are several already in the Eminence & Cedargrove areas. Maybe lower Current??

We also need more, and regular press releases and press ride longs. Communication is the key. I used to teach DARE and found that if you reach the kids you will eventually win the parents. Still -try to reach everyone including the party groups. Tell them that National Parks are Family Friendly. Plant the idea of standards of behavior in National Parks. The bus greeter should be brought back on Saturdays. We need to restore the canoe season to the old April thru October. Press releases may help here. Invite the reporters to come to the park. We used to have a VIP cabin and used it for congressional delegates. I would suggest that it needs to be for Magazine and new paper reporters, state and nationwide. In addition, we need to leave our electric loops open all year and charge all year for them, even if it is strictly honor system picked up once a week.

I am pleased to report that the current superintendent Bill Black, far exceeds his predecessors in his efforts to communicate with the park employees and the surrounding communities. Others have made attempts with the communities such as attending relevant area meetings, but most sent powerless representatives. For example, I was asked to attend both LEPC (Local Emergency Planning Committee) and Stream Team meeting in place of a



manager. I continue to work with these groups as an individual, but the park doesn't support them in any way. When we play nice with people they see us as humans rather than the unapproachable "government" that wants to l "take" more from the locals (their land, their road to their favorite spot, their boating privilege). We have done a poor job of educating them since they don't yet see that this is a national treasure.

And lastly, the Upper Current is more than Round Spring Cave. Cave tours are almost all the interpretation that we get up here. We had history too and should have history interpreted to the visitors. I know that the park tore down the town of Cedargrove that was supposed to have been our historic depression era setting for interpretation. We can recreate in order to teach. We could use the Pulltite Hunting Club cabin as the setting for a historic actor. We could run a stream table in the Pulltite Visitor Center. Just a few thought.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2423 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 06:10:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

I travel several times each year just to bicycle in other biking spots. 2 times each winter to Arizona, once a year with my buddies for a week long bicycle tour, and often with my kids. I have traveled to Arkansas specifically for it's Syllamo mtn bike trail

<http://www.fs.usda.gov/recarea/osfnf/recreation/bicycling/recarea/?recid=43497&actid=24>

Let's do something like that here!

thanks

andy walker

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2424 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 06:12:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

Me my family and friends would love to come and ride for weekend trail riding trips and as well as include the area in century road rides. Camping and hotel overnights would be planned as well

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2425 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 06:15:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of Option B.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2426 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 06:16:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I

also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2427 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 06:17:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I submitted a comment earlier, but this is so important, I feel the need to submit more. I am 71 years old, am disabled, can't walk very far at all without the need to rest, have copd, have bad painful arthritis, I am an honorably discharged, MARINE CORPS veteran. I vote, pay my taxes, and try to live a wholesome life. Of the very few enjoyments left for me, is the camping and fishing I do on the current river. There are a few places that I can drive to and camp, and fish, and enjoy the peace and tranquility of our great outdoors, without the crowding and annoyance of a lot of people. I don't drink, and or party. I take care of the area I'm in, and always pick up any trash that might be in the vicinity of my camp site, as most locals do. The only evidence of me camping would be the remains of my campfire. It doesn't cost much money to do so, and it's a good thing, because I live on a very limited income. I cannot afford to pay fees, so I have to do the best I can, on what I have. I am sure I am not the only one in this situation. And now, the NPS, wants to close all of these areas off, close the accesses to these areas under the guise of preserving it for future generations. BULLCRAP, what about our generation? If you close it for the future, simply means, that it will be closed forever, and under the control of a bunch of people that will never use and enjoy it. You talk about hiring another 25 or so Rangers to police it. You talk about spending up to 8.9 million dollars to do so. WHAT A TOTAL WASTE OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS! At a time when the economy is hurting so bad, you want to kill off what little freedom we still have left. What we have now is working just fine. WE DON'T NEED OR WANT YOUR CHANGES! THEY ARE NOT NESSESARY! All I see this as, is the communistic takeover of our god given free lands, that were donated or bought with tax payer dollars, for the tax payers and citizens to use and enjoy! This is NOT the old Berlin or Russia! The next thing I can see you wanting to do, is build a wall or fence around the whole area! YOU ALREADY HAVE ENOUGH CONTROL! LEAVE US ALONE! TAKE CARE OF YOUR CITIES, THEY NEED ALL THE HELP THEY CAN GET! GET OUT OF OUR LIVES!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2428 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 06:24:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please take NO ACTION on any of the provisions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2429 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 06:30:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am commenting about mountain biking in the scenic rivers area of Missouri. I make several trips (10-15) per year to the ozark trail and would like to see more of this area open to mountain biking. I believe the more who use the area in an environmentally friendly way can only be a good thing because we would want to preserve and maintain it. I also know that the trail users are some of the best builders and caretakers of the ozark trail.

Sincerely, Tim Rister

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2430 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 06:35:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of allowing mountain biking on the Ozark trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2431 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 06:36:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have full faith and confidence in the government agency charged with protecting this valuable natural environment while allowing access to the resource by the citizens. I think it is very important that we preserve these natural wonders for future generations to experience, they are dwindling in size and number as the population grows. You can not "have your cake and eat it too". Motorized boats, more access, motorized vehicles are not part of nature. Unspoiled is unspoiled. Please protect these ever more rare "natural" places. Thank you for the work you do.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2432    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 06:37:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Cycling has a low environmental impact. Creating cycling opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

The mountain biking community traditionally demonstrates excellent stewardship of land, often voluntarily maintaining and improving trails, and self-policing those who use trails at times when the trails themselves are most vulnerable.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2433    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 06:37:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the attention given to and consideration for mountain biking and other trail uses within the General Management Plan, and urge you to give increased consideration for mountain biking in this and future plans. I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways. I urge you to allow mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in this and future plans, wherever possible and appropriate.

Well-designed mountain bike trails are sustainable and do not have adverse environmental impacts when properly constructed in the right locations. In fact, their environmental impact is often far lower than other trail options- -for instance, equestrian trails.

I feel that the current situation, with mountain biking disallowed on all existing trails and bicycling on area roads discouraged by the Scenic Riverways web page, does not allow visitors the full range of recreation options that at normally available at similar state and national parks across the nation. Allowing substantial mountain bike access in areas where it is appropriate would be a very important improvement in this area.

Missouri has a large and active mountain biking population that will very much use and appreciate these trails and access to this beautiful area, if it is provided.

I encourage you to involve bicycling and mountain biking groups when making decisions about trail access in the Scenic Riverways area.

The Ozark Trail Association has built and maintained with volunteer labor nearly 400 miles of single track trail in Missouri. This makes for a perfect bike packing trail with the exception that the Current River Section that passes through the ONSR NPS land is closed to Mountain Biking. What a shame to close 20 miles of trail in the middle of 227 miles of contiguous backcountry trail. Please consider adding mountain biking access to the Ozark Trail through the NPS lands.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2434    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 06:42:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I don't want any boat restrictions on the river. I don't want any restrictions on the horse trails. I don't want any restrictions on where I can camp on the gravel bars. Put more rangers out of the office and on the water patrolling the river and let them earn their money. If you have more rangers on the water, they can control some of the underage drinking.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2435    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 06:46:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Leave the boats alone, don't mess with the horsepower. Leave the gravelbars alone, we are not destroying them. The trails are made by the wild horses, are you going to tell them to quit making trails? Just leave everything alone. We are paying your wages, get out and patrol the river instead of sitting in your little cubical's. Haul out the trash & clean the bathrooms. YOu have to many people sitting around trying to figure out what to take away from us, put them to work.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2436    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 06:52:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We do NOT require any changes to our state's management of land or waterways. LEAVE US ALONE!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2437    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 06:53:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

When my family plans vacation time, one of the factors we include is whether bikes are allowed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2438    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 06:53:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The river does not belong to the National Park service. It belongs to the people. Leave the river alone. God put the river there for us to enjoy and take care of. Which is what we are doing. Leave the horsepower limits alone, or raise them. Do not take close any part of the river to the boats. Leave the horseback riders alone. Leave the atv riders alone. We pick up the trash and take home that the tourist from St. Louis bring with them and scatter about. Instead of you hiring more people why don't you take them out of the offices and put them out working - hauling off trash, patrolling the river, cleaning the bathrooms. Let them earn their money.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2439    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 06:54:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for accepting my comments. I strongly support allowing mountain biking on trails with the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition of mountain biking on all trails within the Scenic Riverway.

Mountain biking has low environmental impact, and mountain bikers generally have shown themselves to be responsible users of outdoor recreational facilities, respective of the environment and other visitors.

In fact, strong partnerships formed by mountain bike groups in the St. Louis area with St. Louis County Parks, the Missouri Department of Conservation, St. Charles County Parks, and other government agencies have resulted in positive relationships, good communication, self-policing of users, partnerships in trail-building and other projects and in general a positive promotion of these terrific outdoor resources with which Missouri has been blessed.

I love to travel to different parts of Missouri and allowing mountain biking in these areas is important to me as a potential visitor and I know would draw others to the area as well who enjoy exploring the outdoors on their bikes.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2440 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:01:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 1. Leave the horsepower alone or raise it.

2. Do not close any of the river to the boats.

3. Leave the trail riders alone. They didn't make all the trails, the wild horses made most of them. Are you going to tell them to not make any more trails

4. The gravel bars were meant to be used. Put trash cans around for the trash.

5. The access's need to be improved so handicap people can get to the river easily.

6. Put more rangers on the water patrolling the river.

I'm on the gravel bar every weekend & don't see trash, we take it back with us.

Being on the river is a part of our life. We go to relax, fish and visit with friends and family. The kids swim and play in the sand. During the winter, we gig and have fish fries. Our grandparents and great-grandparents lived next to the river before their land was taken away.

Just leave the river alone & let us take care of it. We will do a better job than you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2441 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:02:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on the trails in and around Ozarks National Scenic Riverways. Mountain biking is very low impact to the environment and would attract tourists from all across the country. Plus mountain bikers are passionate about giving back to the trails they ride, so you would gain scores of volunteers and donations for trail maintenance. Please consider this as you make your decision.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2442 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:06:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking is a low environmental impact activity that connects people to the land and can be a huge boon to local economies via tourism. I hope the National Park Service does not miss this opportunity to create another great reason to come to southern Missouri.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2443 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:06:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a camper and cyclist. I am positive that if the trails in the Ozark Riverway region were open to bicycles it would be an economic plus for the small towns in that area. I live in southeast Missouri where open trails are few and far between. With a ever growing cycling community in our area this would mean a great deal.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2444 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:07:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support alternative A of the Draft Management Plan.

Please recommend federal wilderness designation for the Big Springs Area. There are few undisturbed areas in the

region and this will best protect this acreage. This will enable you to manage it as wilderness. In 1963, the Assistant Director of the NPS said that preservation of the natural and wilderness qualities should be a major consideration. A wilderness recommendation is consistent with that.

Illegal roads should be closed. As of 2007 there were 131 motorized vehicle access points along the river. This is far more than enough. Some of the pictures by Friends of Ozark Scenic Riverways speak for themselves.

Undesignated horse trails should also be closed and no new trail crossings should be added.

I have not been to the area in recent years, but many years ago I floated the Eleven Point River nearby. It was a nice float and I am considering a trip on the Current River. The Sierra Club runs national outings on the Current River most years and I'd like to have a pleasant experience. The Ozark Scenic Riverways are a National resource, not just of local importance.

Please keep me informed of this process.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2445    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:11:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly support allowing mountain biking on trails with the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition of mountain biking on all trails within the Scenic Riverway.

Mountain biking has low environmental impact, and mountain bikers generally have shown themselves to be responsible users of outdoor recreational facilities, respective of the environment and other visitors.

I enjoy traveling to different parts of Missouri and allowing mountain biking in these areas is important to me as a potential visitor and I know would draw others to the area as well who enjoy exploring the outdoors on their bikes.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2446    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:15:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways. Anything that leaves a rut leads to erosion. Biking on these trails would be a disaster.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2447    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:16:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would enjoy mountain biking in the Ozarks. I have backpacked over 180 miles of the Ozarks highlands trail in arkansas an multiple trails here in Missouri. I have mountain biked in multiple state parks as well. If more mountain biking trails are opened in MO, it would allow different opportunities with less travel required down to Northwest Arkansas state parks an local MO state parks since only a few allow mountain bikes in this area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2448    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:17:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

Hiking and biking draws a lot of visitors to the area. This brings in revenue to the area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2449    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:18:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Park Service,  
Here are my opinions and thoughts:

-Increased law enforcement at campgrounds but not to the extent of a police state. Just enough to get the drunken rowdies out of Cedar Grove Campground.

-Reopen the caves. Humans do not spread WNS. People have stopped enjoying your park because they can not access the caves like Jam Up Cave. Everyone should have chance for responsible recreation.

-Do something grand to reduce overcrowding on the rivers.

-Several years ago, I had a trip ruined on the Jack Fork as I watch a bunch of horses crapping in the river (Not wild horses, but horses with humans attached.) Horses need to be removed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2450    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** [Note: Our complete comment letter was submitted in writing via regular mail. Please refer to the hard copy for the figures.]

February 7, 2014

Mr. Black,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (Plan). The Nature Conservancy (the Conservancy) is a non-profit organization committed to working with multiple partners to advance conservation of the unique biodiversity present in the Current and Jacks Fork River basins. We appreciate the opportunity to provide comment on the National Park Service's (Park) proposal and look forward to working with you on its implementation.

The Conservancy strongly supports the Park's Alternative B. We believe, if fully implemented, it will best balance resource protection and visitor access necessary for the longevity of the unique natural resources and the economies of local communities in the Ozarks. The Conservancy sees the goals of protecting the rivers and the vibrancy of the local economy as mutually beneficial. The Ozarks, particularly the Current and Jacks Fork rivers, contain karst, aquatic, and terrestrial biodiversity that is globally unique and provides habitat for numerous endemic species. The natural beauty of the Ozarks attracts valuable tourism dollars from both local residents and distant visitors. Visitors come to the region for the scenery and high-quality water resources. Local residents rely on the river for daily recreation and it is part of their family heritage. Management decisions and future planning processes should be based upon maintaining the integrity of the biological resources, as this will ensure the long-term viability of the tourism industry and local economies. It is critical the Park has sufficient resources to ensure complete implementation of the plan to successfully strike a balance between resource protection and visitor use.

Detailed below are specific comments on topics addressed in the Plan.

#### HISTORICAL PASTURES AND MEADOWS

The National Park Service should strive to maintain the integrity and viability of the native landscape while providing an opportunity for visitors to experience the cultural heritage of the Ozarks. The Conservancy urges the

Park to amend Alternative B to reduce the number of acres maintained under the agricultural lease program, only retaining selected sites that are beyond a minimum 200-foot riparian buffer zone.[1] Such areas for illustrating the pastoral heritage in the Ozarks should correspond with other key sites for visitors (e.g., old farmsteads with structures or other interpretative qualities).

General Land Office (GLO) data document the contiguous woodland character of the natural landscape in the riparian corridor. These accounts indicate the woodlands had more widely-spaced trees, a mixture of shortleaf pine and oak, and a rich herbaceous understory maintained by fire.[2] Increasing the native woodland cover would provide herbaceous habitat for wildlife and migratory birds without the need for removing forested cover in bottomlands. According to United States Geological Survey (USGS), the trend of land conversion in the Ozark Highlands Ecoregion resulted from the conversion of native forested cover to agriculture uses. Between 1973 and 2000, the percentage increase in agricultural acres is almost equivalent to the decrease in forested cover.[3] We feel it is important to stress the critical nature of maintaining the native forested cover in the riparian zone and floodplain.

Please consider the following as the basis for this recommendation:

#### Bank Stability

Forested riparian zones and floodplains provide stability to alluvial soils. The large root diameter and physical structure of tree roots in combination with the dense, deeply rooted systems of native grasses help streambanks resist erosional forces. A diversity of woody and herbaceous vegetation in alluvial soils in the Ozarks can provide a matrix of rooted support, thereby preventing rapid erosion and habitat degradation from excessive sediment and nutrients in the river. It is also important to maintain forested cover in the floodplain beyond the current riparian zone because river channels naturally migrate over time. In addition, with the predicted impacts of climate change on storm severity and peak flows, it is critical to ensure the maintenance of a stable riparian zone.

Aerial imagery from the past fifteen years reveals several places where the river is changing course adjacent to areas with open pastures. In Examples 1 and 2 below, the width of the forested riparian area has decreased over time as the river has migrated across its floodplain. While these changes have occurred slowly over the course of ten or more years, if the trend continues the river will eventually intersect the agricultural/meadow areas (as can be seen in Example 3). When this occurs, the rate of bank erosion is likely to increase due to the bank's decreased ability to resist erosional forces. Each example has a series of three aerial images (circa 1996, circa 2009, and 2012) with a yellow bracket that represents the same spatial location. The bracket provides a stationary reference for viewing the channel and bank changes within each example.

[Please refer to the hard copy of our comments for the figures.]

Example 1: Downstream of where Highway 106 crosses the Jacks Fork River near Alley Spring.

Example 2: Near Horse Camp on the Jacks Fork River

Example 3: Downstream of Shawnee Creek (the forested riparian area has already been lost at this location)

While examining aerial imagery, we noted several historical pastoral areas that appear to have decreased in extent, thus expanding the forested riparian buffer. We support efforts the Park is taking to prevent erosion and encourage additional measures to restore agricultural areas to cover types more reflective of the native vegetation, prioritizing those sites most at risk of losing the forested riparian area. In addition, we encourage the Park to work with neighboring state and private landowners to encourage land management practices in the floodplain that maintain riparian buffers.

#### Impacts on Wildlife and Unauthorized Vehicle Use

The Plan does not address the environmental consequences of expanding the managed pastoral areas on soils, water quality, wildlife, and long-term viability of intact habitats. Rivers provide travel corridors for wildlife, and multiple openings scattered along this corridor can have adverse effects. Research indicates that edge habitat, as would be created around the perimeters of those maintained open areas, attracts predators and can decrease success of nesting migratory birds.[4] There are several locations where maintained fields have invited unauthorized vehicular/ATV



use that can lead to erosion and disturbs wildlife. These areas can also be vectors for introduction and proliferation of invasive species.

For these reasons, the Conservancy recommends replacing the language that refers to increasing "areas managed as meadows and agricultural sites" (pages 59, 65, 72, and 79) with the following: "The cultural affiliation landscape plan will assess those historical agricultural areas that are outside the 200-foot riparian buffer zone (minimum width) for possible restoration. The Park will evaluate the potential impacts of channel migration and bank erosion on the width of forested riparian areas to determine sites appropriate for continued maintenance as agricultural areas. Forest restoration will be considered as part of the suite of management actions for the existing agricultural sites."

## HORSEPOWER

### Zoning

A review of available literature indicates motor boat use can impact water quality (e.g., increased turbidity, resuspension of nutrients, and release of chemical pollutants), degrade aquatic habitat, and accelerate bank erosion. For example, a series of studies on the upper Mississippi River found recreational boating to be a significant cause of shoreline erosion, localized water quality degradation, and loss of bank stability.[5,6] There are numerous scientific articles evaluating boating impacts, but the subjects are not as well researched on smaller riverine systems like the Current and Jacks Fork rivers.[7]

Given the uncertainty and lack of information about the impact of increased horsepower and higher intensity use on river conditions, the Conservancy recommends a conservative approach. We support Alternative B because it includes new seasonal limitations in certain zones of the Park, retains the 60/40 interpretation of the regulatory maximum, and does not relax existing zonal restrictions on horsepower maximums. This approach could reduce negative impacts of motorboat use in those zones with stricter seasonal limits while preventing an expanded use that might otherwise exacerbate adverse effects motorboats have on water quality and aquatic habitat. Alternative B continues to allow motorboat use on the larger portions of the Current and Jacks Fork rivers where habitat impact would be expected to be minimal. To better inform future management decisions and ensure the resource is adequately protected, the Park should assess the potential impacts from motorboat use and implement a long-term monitoring strategy.

### Recreation Season

The Plan defines the peak recreation season for purposes of limiting motor boat use as March 15 through Labor Day. The Conservancy supports this definition, as this will not only limit user conflicts in the upper portions of the rivers, but could also reduce disturbance in shallow water habitats during fish spawning seasons.

## UNDESIGNATED ROADS AND TRAILS

The Conservancy supports a well-managed system of designated trails, crossings, and access points. Along with the maintenance of a designated system, the Conservancy supports the Park's intent to continue closure and restoration of undesignated, degraded sites. Undesignated travel corridors are unmanaged and can cause erosion, water quality degradation, and damage to terrestrial and aquatic habitats. Given the extent of use in some areas on undesignated trails, we believe it is important to provide a well-managed alternative to discourage use of the unmanaged/closed areas. We support the Park's balance of adding new opportunities for hiking, biking and trail riding, which is important to community and visitor enjoyment, while eliminating the unmanaged sites and enforcing closures.

The Conservancy understands that the Plan is intended to provide a framework, rather than specifics, for management. We look forward to working with the Park to develop a more effective and sustainable road and trail strategy that meets visitor needs while sustaining habitat integrity. One particular area of clarification needed is how the Park intends to define "undesignated" roads, trails, and access points. While the plan states that there are approximately 90 designated and undesignated river access points (page 216), it does not enumerate how many are undesignated, or explain how the Park intends to define an undesignated site for the purposes of closure. To illustrate our concern with the lack of definition, please consider the case of the Flying W access between Cedar Grove and Akers Ferry:

Flying W is not recognized on the NPS visitor map as a river access point, yet the Park proposed and approved improvement to the area in 2007. None of the alternatives for Flying W evaluated closing the access point completely, despite the intention expressed in the current draft Plan to close undesignated locations. The experience

at Flying W suggests that users can define access points through continued unauthorized use. In this case, the Park proposed (in 2007) granting direct access to a natural feature that is commonly used for cliff jumping, despite the legal documentation of injury at this site[8] and the Park's expressly stated prohibition of cliff jumping in Park rules.

Setting aside the argument of whether or not Flying W is an acceptable location to designate access, the case of Flying W provides an opportunity to reiterate the need for the Park to have sufficient resources to fully implement and enforce the plan. The Park obviously invested significant resources to evaluate, propose alternatives, and seek public comment for Flying W. An August 30, 2007 press release (<http://www.nps.gov/ozar/parknews/flying-w.htm>) indicates the project was approved, but it appears that nothing has been implemented to date. In addition, the site is continuing to degrade the river due to soil erosion, gully formation, and undesignated road use. While in support of Alternative B, the Conservancy stresses the importance of full implementation to ensure the desired balance between resource protection and user access is achieved.

## WILDERNESS

The Conservancy does not support wilderness designation for the Big Springs tract. However, we strongly support maintaining this area in its current primitive condition. Given historical resource constraints and the potential added cost of doing management under the "minimum requirements analysis," we are concerned a wilderness designation could limit the Park's ability to implement good forest management (e.g., prescribed fire) and respond to threats of a changing climate (e.g., invasive species, forest pests).

## FACILITIES AND ROADS

The Federal Leadership in High Performance and Sustainable Buildings Memorandum of Understanding outlines the federal government's commitment to the design, construction, and maintenance of energy efficient, sustainable facilities.[9] The Plan references sustainable design in several locations and cites the NPS 2006 Management Policies as the guiding document. The Conservancy supports the Park's ongoing efforts to incorporate sustainable design principles when expanding or upgrading existing facilities (e.g., LEED design, permeable surfaces, low impact design for stormwater flows, updated sanitary sewer systems). Construction activities should embrace state-of-the-art standards for design and construction, both protecting the resource and serving as a compelling demonstration of best practices that can be adopted elsewhere.

The Conservancy recommends environmentally sensitive maintenance (ESM) techniques for improvements and maintenance of culverts and gravel roads.[10,11] ESM approaches construction and maintenance of gravel roads with consideration of downstream water quality impacts as central to the design. The practices are promoted by the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), Environmental Protection Agency, Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, and many states across the country. Studies show that these techniques better withstand severe weather events, reduce erosion and sedimentation, and have lower life-cycle costs than traditional methods.[12,13] These techniques could reduce the demand on the Park's limited budget, help the infrastructure withstand future changes in climate, improve water quality, and reconnect aquatic habitats. The Conservancy recommends incorporating a reference to ESM techniques on page 90 under the Sustainable Development heading and by revising the second bulleted statement under Factor 5 on page 41 to: "Establish a partnership with the counties regarding road management, including closures, and promote the use of environmentally sensitive maintenance techniques on all roads within the Park boundaries."

## RESTORATION

The Conservancy strongly encourages the Park to incorporate natural channel design principles in stream restoration rather than traditional, engineered solutions for bank restoration (e.g., using toe wood and floodplain reconnection rather than armoring banks with rip-rap). Doing so would provide a showcase for other resource managers and national parks while protecting the resource in a way that preserves the aesthetics of the region. Federal agencies, such as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, NRCS, and USFS, are among the nationwide leaders in teaching and implementing these techniques for stream restoration and stabilization, which has proven to effectively recover and stabilize degraded streams while maximizing ecological benefit and long-term system viability.[14]

The Plan (page 174) notes implementing erosion and sediment control to protect hellbender habitat, and avoiding riparian corridor and channel alterations. The disturbance in the system may be a result of unnatural rates of change in the channel geomorphology that, without proper restoration, will continue unabated. To the extent that existing Park regulations will permit, the Conservancy recommends adding language that would allow the Park to implement

restoration projects in the riparian corridors or channels if it is (1) based on natural channel design principles, (2) necessary to restore the reach to a balanced state, and (3) necessary to prevent further degradation of downstream habitat.

The Conservancy supports the Park's proposal to replace the Cedar Grove bridge crossing. The existing crossing impedes the river's ability to transmit water and sediment downstream. The bridge essentially functions as a check dam, holding gravel upstream and scouring the bed and banks downstream. Incorporating natural channel design into the restoration of this site will be critical for returning the river to its natural gradient, providing flood capacity, preventing degradation, and protecting the streambanks from further erosion after the bridge is replaced. One resource that may be helpful for the Park is the Natural Channel Design Review Checklist developed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Environmental Protection Agency.[15]

## DATA GAPS AND RESEARCH NEEDS

### Gravel Mining

The discussion on gravel mining may have excluded available information. Chapter 4 of the plan notes four permitted gravel mining operations in the Jacks Fork River sub-basin, and cites a report by the Missouri Department of Conservation (MDC) that identified 41 observed gravel mining sites within the Current River basin. MDC watershed assessments identified 52 active gravel mines along the Current River[16] and 13 gravel mines or limestone quarries along the Jacks Fork River.[17] This suggests there may be data the Park overlooked in examining the extent of operations in the watershed.

Although the discussion of affected environment (Chapter 4) seems to recognize the presence of unpermitted sites, they are not included in the environmental consequences and cumulative impacts in Chapter 5 (pages 238, 241, and 254). Missouri state regulations allow unpermitted surface mining by any "1. Individual for personal use only; and 2. Political subdivision including, but not limited to, county, city, state, or branch of the military which uses its own personnel and equipment to obtain minerals for its own use." [18] These numerous, legal, unpermitted gravel operations could be adversely affecting aquatic habitat and water quality in the Jacks Fork and Current rivers, and should be considered in the discussion of cumulative impacts.

### Sediment and Nutrients

The Environmental Protection Agency identified excessive sediment and nutrients as two critical threats to water quality nationwide.[19] These two pollutants are difficult to manage because they are naturally occurring, and sources are often diffuse and dispersed across the landscape. They are especially important in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways because the basin is minimally impacted by industry, mining, urban runoff and point source wastewater discharges as compared with other watersheds in Missouri.

Research by the USGS on sediment transport in the basin indicates historical land use changes and clearing along the riparian corridor have resulted in increased bedload sediment and decreased bank stability, respectively.[20] As the bedload is transported through the system, reaches become wider and shallow, degrading aquatic habitat. Habitat degradation resulting from increased sediment loading may be critical in addressing the needs of the endangered hellbender populations, and as such, should be monitored closely.

The Plan (page 165) discusses the naturally low nutrient levels in the river, as measured by long-term monitoring data. The Conservancy encourages the Park to work with the State of Missouri to ensure regulatory protection of those naturally low levels of nutrients. Unlike the fecal contamination that resulted in the listing of the Jacks Fork River as impaired, there are no analogous numeric criteria in the state of Missouri to ensure water quality is maintained in the rivers. Given the unique character of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, statewide or regional criteria may not be protective. The Park should continue to monitor nutrient trends in the rivers to ensure a solid foundational dataset is available should the state pursue criteria. In addition, should levels begin to exceed natural background concentrations and visual forms of impairment are observed (e.g., increased algal growth), the Park and State would have data for helping determine impairment.

For these reasons, continued monitoring of sediment and nutrient levels are critically important for determining future impairment and impacts of land management activities on in-stream water quality and habitat.

## ITEMS FOR CLARIFICATION

## Easements

The Conservancy requests clarification on the management of Park easements. The Plan outlines the location and general role of easements within the Park and notes (page 16) that "any request to modify existing easement restrictions that would affect either the land or structures must be evaluated by the National Park Service before approval." It further explains (page 238) that "improperly managed scenic easements can result in negative effects on viewsheds along the river corridors over time." It would be helpful if the Plan included the following:

- General overview of the Park's easement monitoring activities,
- Staffing needs for monitoring, enforcement, and compliance, and
- Description of the review process for requests to modify easement restrictions.

## Definitions and Maps

It would be helpful if the plan included a glossary or illustrative maps to better define the following terms and subjects:

- Backcountry camps,
- Primitive camps,
- Designated trail/road/access points, and
- Undesignated trail/road/access points.

At present, the plan identifies certain miles of designated trails and refers to designated access points. A map would be helpful for understanding what the Park considers to be the current extent of designated roads, trails, and access points, and the extent of the undesignated network.

## References

A 2006 study by Davis and Barr is referenced in the text discussing bacteria levels in the Jacks Fork; however, the full citation for this report is missing in the Reference section.

The plan references guidance provided in a 1991 roads and trails study for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, as well as other National Park Service reports. If these reports are available online, it would be helpful if a link was included as part of the citation for those interested in reviewing the referenced guidance material.

## CONCLUSION

The Nature Conservancy appreciates the opportunity to comment on this Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. We look forward to working closely with Park staff and stakeholders to develop further details for implementing the plan. We believe ongoing monitoring, assessment, and effective enforcement of regulations are an integral part of future management to sustain the Park's irreplaceable resources for the benefit of present and future generations. We reiterate our support of the Park's preferred Alternative B. The Conservancy supports this option because we believe, if fully implemented, it will best balance resource protection and user access necessary for the longevity of the unique natural resources and communities of the Ozarks.

Sincerely,

Todd Sampsell  
State Director  
The Nature Conservancy in Missouri

Steve McMillan  
Owner, McMillan Construction  
Chair, Missouri Board of Trustees

## REFERENCES

[1] The Missouri Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (NRCS 2013) identifies 200 feet as the width for establishing forested riparian areas ([http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE\\_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb1143433.pdf](http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb1143433.pdf)). Larger riparian zones may be appropriate for water quality and wildlife habitat.

[2] Ladd, D. 1991. Reexamination of the role of fire in Missouri oak woodlands. Proceedings of the Oak Woods Management Workshop. Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, IL. pp. 67-80.

[3] Karstensen, K.A., 2010, Land-cover change in the Ozark Highlands, 1973-2000: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2010-1198, 13 p.

[4] Robinson, S.K., F.R. Thompson III, T.M. Donovan, D.R. Whitehead, and J. Faaborg. 1995. Regional forest fragmentation and the nesting success of migratory birds. *Science*. Vol 267. 31 March 1995. Pp. 1987-1990. <http://www.prbo.org/cms/docs/terre/Robinsonetal1985science.pdf>

Flaspohler, D.J., S.A. Temple, and R.N. Rosenfield. 2001. Species-specific edge effects on nest success and breeding bird density in a forest landscape. *Ecological Applications* 11:32-46. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1890/1051-0761\(2001\)011\[0032:SSEEON\]2.0.CO;2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1890/1051-0761(2001)011[0032:SSEEON]2.0.CO;2)

Chalfoun, A.D., M.J. Ratnaswamy, and F.R. Thompson III. 2002. Songbird nest predators in forest-pasture edge and forest interior in a fragmented landscape. *Ecological Applications* 12:858-867. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1890/1051-0761\(2002\)012\[0858:SNPIFP\]2.0.CO;2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1890/1051-0761(2002)012[0858:SNPIFP]2.0.CO;2)

[5] Johnson, S. B., 1994. Recreational Boating Impact Investigations, Upper Mississippi River System, Pool 4, Red Wing, Minnesota. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. LTRMP-EMTC Special Report 94-S004.

[6] MNDNR. 2004. Shoreline and Water Quality Impacts from Recreational Boating on the Mississippi River. Minnesota Department of Natural Resources - Mississippi River Landscape Team. Available online: [http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/aboutdnr/reports/impacts\\_mississippi.html](http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/aboutdnr/reports/impacts_mississippi.html)

[7] York, D. 1994. Recreational-boating Disturbances of Natural Communities and Wildlife: An Annotated Bibliography. Department of the Interior. National Biological Survey. Biological Report 22. May 1994.

[8] Will v. United States, 656 F. Supp. 776 (Missouri 1987)  
[http://www.leagle.com/decision/19871432656FSupp776\\_11317](http://www.leagle.com/decision/19871432656FSupp776_11317)

[9] Federal Leadership in High Performance and Sustainable Buildings Memorandum of Understanding. 2006. Available online: <https://www1.eere.energy.gov/femp/pdfs/mouhighperfsustainablefacs.pdf>

[10] Anderson, J.A. and A.L. Gesford. 2007. Environmentally Sensitive Maintenance for Dirt and Gravel Roads. Available online: <http://water.epa.gov/polwaste/nps/sensitive.cfm>

[11] Pennsylvania State University Center for Dirt and Gravel Road Studies. <http://www.dirtandgravel.psu.edu/>

[12] Levine, J. 2013. An Economic Analysis of Improved Road-Stream Crossings. The Nature Conservancy - Adirondack Chapter. Available online: <http://www.nature.org/ourinitiatives/regions/northamerica/road-stream-crossing-economic-analysis.pdf>

[13] Where the River Meets the Road. The Nature Conservancy - Adirondack Chapter. Available online: <http://www.nature.org/ourinitiatives/regions/northamerica/unitedstates/newyork/explore/new-york-culvert-inventory.xml>

[14] For a recent example, see Pierce and others, 2013, Response of wild trout to stream restoration over two decades in the Blackfoot River Basin, Montana, *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 142:68-81.

[15] Harman, W., R. Starr. 2011. Natural Channel Design Review Checklist. US Fish and Wildlife Service, Chesapeake Bay Field Office, Annapolis, MD and US Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds, Wetlands Division. Washington, D.C. EPA 843-B-12-005

[16] MDC. 2003. Current River Watershed Inventory and Assessment. Missouri Department of Conservation. Prepared by: Thomas F. Wilkerson Jr., West Plains, Missouri. Available online: <http://mdc.mo.gov/your-property/greener-communities/missouri-watershed-inventory-and-assessment/current-river>

[17] MDC. 2001. Jacks Fork Watershed Inventory and Assessment. Missouri Department of Conservation. Prepared

by: Thomas F. Wilkerson Jr., West Plains, Missouri. Available online: <http://mdc.mo.gov/your-property/greener-communities/missouri-watershed-inventory-and-assessment/jacks-fork-river>

[18] Missouri Code of State Regulations. 2005. 10 CSR 40-10.010. Permit Requirements for Industrial Mineral Operations. 4/30/05.

[19] EPA. 2009. Draft National Rivers and Streams Assessment 2008-2009 Report. Environmental Protection Agency. Available online: [http://water.epa.gov/type/watersheds/monitoring/aquaticsurvey\\_index.cfm](http://water.epa.gov/type/watersheds/monitoring/aquaticsurvey_index.cfm)

[20] USGS. 1996. Programs in Missouri. U.S. Geological Survey Fact Sheet FS-027-96. <http://pubs.usgs.gov/fs/FS-027-96/>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2451    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:29:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible. Improving the roads and allowing mountain biking will draw tourist from all over the United States to Missouri which in turn will increase overall revenue for the state.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2452    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:30:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2453    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:30:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm firmly FOR opening up the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to Mtn bikes! I've seen in so many cases where opening up trails to mtn bikers has led to greater visitors to the target areas. Mountain biking is a low impact environmental way to get more people to the area to enjoy the great landscapes and get out into nature. Personally I have not been to the area yet but with mtn bike trails added it would be on my list and probably replace some of the many trips I make to Arkansas I take to ride my bike. I also think that adding better access to Road biking would also be beneficial to the area. These small steps would bring in a diverse and nature loving crowd to the Riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2454    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:31:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a new resident of Missouri and haven't had a chance to go to the Ozark rivers yet. Years ago, I enjoyed canoeing in the little rivers of the Pine Barrens in NJ.

There need to be more protections so that the part of nature that we are going out to enjoy isn't destroyed. Yes, there need to be limits on the size of motors on boats and certain designated trails for horse back riding.

It is time to look carefully at the management of this area.

Sincerely,  
Margie Richards

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2455    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:31:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I

also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2456    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:33:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the attention given to and consideration for mountain biking and other trail uses within the General Management Plan, and urge you to give increased consideration for mountain biking in this and future plans. I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways. I urge you to allow mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in this and future plans, wherever possible and appropriate.

Well-designed mountain bike trails are sustainable and do not have adverse environmental impacts when properly constructed in the right locations. In fact, their environmental impact is often far lower than other trail options- for instance, equestrian trails.

I feel that the current situation, with mountain biking disallowed on all existing trails and bicycling on area roads discouraged by the Scenic Riverways web page, does not allow visitors the full range of recreation options that at normally available at similar state and national parks across the nation. Allowing substantial mountain bike access in areas where it is appropriate would be a very important improvement in this area.

Missouri has a large and active mountain biking population that will very much use and appreciate these trails and access to this beautiful area, if it is provided.

I encourage you to involve bicycling and mountain biking groups when making decisions about trail access in the Scenic Riverways area.

This is a great idea thanks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2457    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:35:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

Most mountain bikers I know are very active in trail building and maintenance, and know what it takes to maintain trails. Therefore will leave a trail in better shape than when they started.

I would like to visit this beautiful park more often, but opt for places I can ride my bike instead.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2458    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:35:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Mountain Bikes deserve to have same trail access as most other disciplines. Since most states have trail building programs and national programs like IMBA most riders know proper trail uses and are not the

ones tearing up trail anymore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2459    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:36:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I do not want our scenic waterways changed! We all that actually live in the nearby areas, love swimming, canoeing, boating, tubing, czmping etc! I believe, if an ACCURATE vote were taken from the river AREAS, the majority would vote to keep the area as is. However, when you go to cities, where you allow those who are not part of the community and spend very little time or money in the area, to vote on this matter, it is WRONG! Sure they are tourists; what happens after the tourists come? The LOCALS clean up their mess! But then they are sllowed to change the area to their desires? Wrong, wrong wrong!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2460    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:36:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support mountain biking in the Ozark park system. The mountain biking community is very environmentally aware. The trails (mostly built and maintained by volunteer groups) have very low impact on the environment and are designed to be enjoyed by hikers, bikers, and equestrians alike. Just look at the work being done by volunteers in St Louis, St Charles counties and the Ozark Trail Association, it's amazing!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2461    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:38:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am concerned about the National Park Service plans which will violate property rights of landowners and businesses along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers in Southern Missouri. This area is highly dependent on tourism for the livelihood of many of its residents. I request a "no action" alternative due to interference with property/business owners by Non-Governmental Organizations through the National Park Service. I also request a return of this area to the State of Missouri for management.

This action is reminiscent of the White River Watershed National Blueway designation from 2013. In the "Blueway" situation, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), some with ties to United Nations Secretariat on the Convention of Wetlands, (aka, the Ramsar Convention), were given undue influence over 1 million residents and their private property.

Through the Department of Interior, Agriculture, and Army, these NGO "Partners" were able to hide their excessive influence from public view and were even writing the proposed restrictions which were to be place on private landowners. Private owners of millions of acres of land and water were at risk of losing their property rights when this illegal action was taken WITHOUT NOTIFICATION of the land/water owners OR their elected officials.

The National Park Service is now giving undue influence of NGOs and their members over the Constitutional Rights of landowners along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. Those who 'think' they know best how to manage the private property along these rivers, must Cease & Desist their overt usurpation of the land and water rights of the legal owners of this land and water access!

NO ACTION should be taken in this matter which further erodes the legal rights of private landowners, and any active management of this area SHOULD BE RETURNED TO THE STATE OF MISSOURI.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2462    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:39:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** February 7, 2014

To the National Park Service:

I fully support the implementation of either Alternative A or Alternative B by the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.



Growing up nearby the rivers, on a headwater tributary of the Jack's Fork near Willow Springs, my fondest childhood memories are all on the Jack's Fork River. In the 1990's, the river was relatively under-used, with ATV and horse seemingly less than it was today. My family could camp near Blue Spring for Bee Bluff and see very few people.

Today, the National Park has become overrun with rampant ATV use. I cannot think of a single other National Park in the United States that has become so degraded by the illegal use of motor vehicles. Every single gravel bar, no matter how remote, is covered with ATV tracks, and their crossings of the river are obvious. The ATV tracks and noise spoil the wilderness character of the river.

While the upper Jack's Fork still has some wilderness quality remaining, the Upper Current is extremely impaired. I have not floated the Upper Current in years, solely due to the extreme level of overuse and impairment. The last times I have floated it; there have been hundreds of people exhibiting lewd and indecent behavior that would have them arrested in any other national park. Numerous vehicles drive to the river on illegal roads, park on the gravel bars, and blare loud music. The infamous "Flying W" spot downriver from Cedar Grove is a prime example of what is wrong with this river.

On the Current south of Two Rivers, jet boats race along the river, narrowly missing canoeists and tubers, eroding river banks, and breaking the silence of the wilderness.

Although the rivers are a National Park, designated by Congress, they are not treated as such by the visitors, nor have they ever been treated as such. The Park Service's lack of enforcement over the past 50 years, where people have been able to get away with anything, is the prime reason for this, along with the proliferation of illegal access trails.

I applaud either the Alternative A or B plans. The rivers are a treasure to Missouri and must be protected at all costs. They are a natural treasure of scenic beauty and biodiversity, not an amusement park.

Sincerely,

Lucas P. Carr

Farmington, MO

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2463    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:40:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hi, I appreciate the opportunity to submit comments on this proposal. I am an avid outdoorsmen, including mountain biking. I would like to see the trails in the Ozark region opened to mountain bikes. Opening up trails to mountain bikes allows a much larger segment of the population to enjoy the trails and the beauty that the area offers. Due to the remoteness of the region and no significant population centers closeby, I wouldn't anticipate overuse or any real problems that can sometimes be associated with overuse. My friends and I often drive two hours to northern regions of the Ozark trail to enjoy the challenging terrain and beauty of the Ozarks, and of course, every time we go we provide a very small boost to the local economy there, often filling up with gas, buying a few items at the local stores, maybe renting campsites, and having lunch or dinner at a local caf  . These otherwise economically depressed areas could certainly use more tourism as it is the lifeblood of their economy, and I think approving bikes to the trails would provide another small boost.

Thank you!  
Bryan Greaser

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2464    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:45:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is near and dear to my heart. I am in support of Plan B. It is important to educate others on the value of our natural resources. I support limiting motorized boat and ATV

usage, but would prefer to dispense with the allowance of it altogether. Trail maintenance is of the utmost importance to encourage future visitors. As a researcher myself, I advocate the upkeep of the research facilities- --especially that of Powder Mill Research Center- --in order to accommodate the great amount of valuable research that foundations are doing for the Park, asking nothing in return.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2465    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:46:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition of mountain biking on all trails within the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

Mountain biking on all trails in the ONSR will also bring more people to those rural areas, generating more revenue.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2466    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:47:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2467    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:47:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This letter is in support of allowing / facilitating Mt Biking along and within the boundaries of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

Because Mt. Biking includes "Back Country" to "Extreme" it is important to recognize that this area has a great deal of appeal to "Back Country" bikers - individuals such as my wife and I in our 60s who enjoy the places a Mt. Bike can take you - and that the extreme / aggressive Mt. Bikers who - for those activities - would find other locations accessible and more appealing.

However, even considering the entire range of mountain biker's skill sets, interests and styles....we have (in the last seven years) never had a negative experience while either hiking or biking where Mt. Bikes are allowed.

One, you can hear them coming. Two, it is very simple to let them know you are sharing the trail. Following this simple premise it has been refreshing to encounter young people who - while enthusiastic about their sport - have always been courteous and acted in a manner that demonstrated they were concerned about our safety.

If trail damage is a concern; know that a torn up trail means a poor Mt. Bike experience so you are more likely to find a Mt. Biker repairing or grooming a trail than you are finding one tearing it up. (In our area of SW Missouri we often find ourselves repairing the damage to the trails done by horses; but, even in this arena, there is a certain amount of harmony because of a shared love the outdoors.)

If shared use is a concern; this would be easy to test by allowing Mt. Biking on odd number days of the month or specific days during the week. One could also "test" by granting permission to an emerging class of Mt. Bikes referred to as a "fat bike" (which, because of a much wider tire, is pretty much incapable of damaging a trail).

Bottom line; there is some testing that can be done and - at the minimum - I encourage you to do it as opposed to just saying no.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2468    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:50:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Alternative A. I am in favor of this because of my experiences as a canoeist. The last few years, I have planned my times on being on the Current River to avoid the power boats. That means trying to avoid the weekends. Powerboats are a nuisance because they speed by canoes, sometimes causing quite a wake. Plus their engine fuels stink! I am also concerned about the number of trailers I've seen at access points seemingly parked there for an entire season. These "camps" often start to look like shanty towns. My suggestions follow:

1. Lower horsepower limits for power boats.
2. Limit power boat access.
3. Patrol the river.
4. Allow camper trailers at only designated camp sites.
5. Keep horse trails separate from hiking trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2469    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:50:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

In addition, the mountain biking community has helped build and maintain thousands of miles of trails. This large group of potential users will improve the experience for everyone who uses these trails. Cyclists in general make a positive contribution to trails and to the local economy wherever they are allowed access.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2470    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 07:50:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** After reviewing the proposed alternatives I feel that alternative C "No Action" is the best course of action for the ONSR. This gives the opportunity for the most citizens to enjoy the park in a variety of different ways. Also, as a frequent visitor of the park for several decades and based on the environmental impact studies, I do not believe there is an ecological reason to further restrict access to the ONSR.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2471    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:00:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear committee, planners, reviewers:

I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

Whenever I plan a family or solo trip anywhere for vacation, I always consider bringing my bike with me - especially my mountain bike. My family and I often base our decision on where to visit, where to spend money, and what to do based on bicycling accessibility. We believe bicycling is a healthy, environmentally friendly activity that should be greatly expanded and encouraged. The mountain biking community is, you will find, one of the greatest groups of conservationists you will find.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2472    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:00:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support mountain biking on trails in the Ozark National Forest.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2473    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:01:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed "riverways" plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. As the options proposed are well documented, I will be brief. I strongly oppose modification to the existing rules as proposed, and support the "No-Action Alternative".

I have spent time on the Current River since I was a young man, and have enjoyed canoing, fishing, and camping on the gravel bars with friends and family. Camping and turkey hunting near the Log Yard access is an annual event that I look forward to every year. During those outings we gather on the gravel bar and set up our camper. We hunt during the morning and then launch our boat and fish in the afternoons. These events provide us with experiences that have been shared with our children and have built appreciation for the Missouri outdoors that crosses multiple generations.

Being able to pick a camp site while floating on the river provides the element of wilderness that is difficult to find. The vast majority of those who use the river in this way are responsible and abuse is uncommon.

I strongly encourage decision makers to respect the traditions that I have outlined above and to make no changes in access to the river and the surrounding forests for camping, hunting, fishing, floating and boating.

Respectfully,

Steve Marler (Lifetime Permit Conservation Partner)  
807 W Columbia  
Farmington, MO 63640

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2474    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:04:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

We pay taxes and we would like to take full advantage of the outdoor recreation our state offers

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2475    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:05:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I

also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

I am a nurse practitioner and work at Washington University. I enjoy all kinds of outdoor activities including hiking, biking, kayaking, backpacking, etc. I love Missouri and am respectful of our environment. I commute to work on foot or by bicycle and train, by choice. I would love the opportunity to explore the Ozarks more with my bike and on foot.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2476    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:05:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I'm a mountain bike rider and it is worth commending Missouri for having some of the best riding in the Midwest. I live south of St. Louis but have ridden as far away as St. Charles and Potosi (Berryman Trail) as part of my yearly travels to different trails. I've traveled to Northern Arkansas to ride trails there. It would be wonderful to have even more options and new scenery to enjoy in South Central Missouri as it would be much closer than the Buffalo River, AR area.

I used to live in Colorado where my bike travels often ran into wilderness areas where bikes are prohibited - and on one such trip my friends and I carried our bikes across 8 miles of wilderness trail just so that we could see it on our 50 mile bike ride along the Colorado Trail. We broke down the bikes, slung them on our backs, and started hiking. We, like most avid mountain bikers - and most people who enjoy time outdoors - follow the rules.

I'd respectfully request you open what trails you can for mountain bikers. I think you will find our group a vibrant ally with many clubs dedicated to making our state's trails some of the best in the nation.

Thank you for your time,

Brian King  
Imperial, MO 63052

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2477    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:06:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

Many more visitors will find a reason to come and use the park

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2478    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:06:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I prefer alternative A as outlined in the Draft General Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement.

Specifically, my experience in the Riverways, hiking and canoeing in designated areas are a wonderful way to experience the beauty.

These uses are important to me because I find serenity in the unmarred areas of our state. In addition, I appreciate the conservation and preservation functions of the National Park because motorized vehicle traffic on gravel bars is causing problems for the watershed. The primary area(s) I use are the Current and Jacks Fork river areas. The 'No Action alternative is unacceptable to me because it fails to address the need for more enforcement of existing laws and standards, to better manage overcrowding, and to improve communication and partnership with local landowners and communities. Further, it fails to address these critical problems in the Riverways including the seemingly ever-expanding presence of motorized vehicles and their maze of eroded tracks in riparian areas and on gravel bars; the explosive growth of equestrian use and proliferation of undesignated trails and river crossings (many of which are in sensitive riverine areas or on steep, heavily-eroded slopes); overcrowding in certain reaches of the rivers and resulting conflicts among user groups, coupled with the rowdy behavior of some visitors; and inadequate monitoring and enforcement of scenic easements. However, the Riverways has seen a 30% reduction in staff in the last decade, owing to decreases in funding, and there is no guarantee that funds will be enhanced to the levels anticipated by the plan alternatives. That is one reason to approach with caution higher cost alternatives that feature increased development and more intensive use like those presented in Alternative C. We favor maintaining visitation at approximately the current level while emphasizing improvements that are less demanding in terms of staff and more conducive to family recreation. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways ('Riverways'), established on August 17, 1964, encompasses 134 miles of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. The Riverways enabling act has three stated purposes: preservation, conservation, and recreation. As Missouri's largest National Park, it showcases several world-class freshwater springs, caves, and bluffs that are home to fish, birds, rare and endangered native amphibians, crawfish, and plants. It is a testament to Missouri's commitment to conservation that the Riverways is a National Park and was the nation's first National River. The Current River and Jacks Fork are prime recreational waters in a stunning natural karst area that attracts approximately 1.5 million visitors each year. A 2011 study estimated visitor spending at more than \$55 million with nearly 90 percent of spending from non-local visitors. As a unit of the National Park System, management of the Riverways must ensure protection of the Park's resources in an unimpaired condition for public recreation, education, and scientific value. Among its tasks is sustaining and restoring bio-diversity for the next generation. The management of ONSR in terms of resource preservation, sustainable use management, and restoration of natural ecosystems should rival that of our nation's most pristine and unique public lands.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2479    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:10:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I prefer Alternative \_\_\_\_A\_\_\_\_ as outlined in the Draft General Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement.

Specifically, my experience in the Riverways in the following recreational uses:  
 Canoeing, hiking, photography, cave monitoring, cave mapping.  
 These uses are important to me because:

In an ever increasing urbanization, continued removal of irreplaceable natural resources, Missouri needs the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to remain uncorrupted by short-term gains by the few. It is a national treasure that must be sustained. There are other lakes and rivers for power boats and other activities that would corrupt the ONSR-let's ensure that the Jacks Fork and Current River be reserved for those who appreciate nature in its natural state.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2480    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:11:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Opening up select trails to Mountain Biking makes sense. It will promote tourism and help to bring revenue to many local businesses. I was raised in Western Missouri and still spend the bulk of my vacation/leisure time in the State.

Opening up more trails to Mountain Biking encourages fitness, encourages people to explore parts of the state not previously explored and as such will promote many return trips for many people, with family and friends bringing with them revenue for local businesses and revenue for the state with Sales Tax dollars. Please allow the development of trails for Mountain Biking in many of the parks in Missouri. It will be a good decision for locals and those that travel into the area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2481 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:11:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

My friends and I currently take 3 to 4 trips a year to road and mountain biking rides. Pumping dollars into those economies, I would like to see more of that in Missouri. I also believe that areas with easy access to businesses via walking and biking make better places to live.

Sincerely,  
Mark Spreitler

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2482 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:13:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family and friends spent many wonderful times on the Jacks Fork. We spent family vacations there and we had two weekends a year with friends from all over the State for nearly 20 years. I'm not conversant with the details of the plans, but I can tell you what I don't like to see happen to the scenic river ways.

I appreciate the locals need to use motor boats to continue their tradional use of the rivers. I don't think they need to use high powered boats. I don't think visitors should be able to use motor boats, 4-wheelers or motorcycles.

I loved to paddle down the river and hear a banjo tuning up for a Blue Grass festival. That's not possible with motorized recreational gear roaring up, down, thru and around the river.

I have no problem with the horses. They add to the ambience unless their riders are not respectful of the canoes.

I think extending the protection to Big Springs is a good thing.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2483 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:13:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** NO action- no federal control

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2484 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:14:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is a cherished national treasure. I support further expanding its recreational use and accessibility by opening the trails to mountain biking. The environmental impact of trail biking is minimal, and the riders are sensitive to preservation policies.

Organizations like the Gateway Off Road Cyclists(GORC), Ozark Trail Association and MoBikeFed work hard to educate trail users about trail preservation, etiquette and sustainable design. With access to the Ozark Scenic Riverways, trail cyclists will enjoy the natural beauty and heritage of this great region. The local economies of the region will also benefit.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2485 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:14:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a landowner in Shannon county, Mo on Sinking Creek, one of the tributaries of the Current river. I have been watching and listening to the debate around the Park Service management plan for ONSR with great interest and concern. As a guest of the park for the last 40 years, I've seen a level of environmental impact that has degraded my enjoyment of this special natural resource. The roads that bring vehicles and people with their stereo systems and campers now allow access to almost every gravel bar. The last time I floated the Current river, we had trouble finding a place to take out and camp because every gravel bar was full of vehicles. The floating experience is also compromised because of the overuse fostered by so much motor vehicle traffic. No longer is the river a peaceful place to get away from modern life. It is an extension of it, including the trappings of electronic entertainment and fossil fueled noise. Please protect this special place. I strongly encourage the Park Service to adopt either plan A or plan B or a combination of the two.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2486 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:18:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on the trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking is low environmental impact and mountain bikers are usually active in trail building and habitat restoration.

Thank You,  
Boyd (Buzz) Taylor

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2487 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:19:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Mtb people are awesome. They will promote park usage and be stewards for the land

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2488 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:20:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** leave things as they are. there's no need to waste more money. just take care of the parks that are there now. from what I know the parks dept or anyone else doesn't have the money to waste on unnecessary projects. If you want to spend some money hire a few more park rangers and other support people.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2489 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:21:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family and I regularly participate in boating, floating, hiking, camping, fishing, and gigging. These activities are important to us because we can do these things as a family and it teaches our daughter about our environment, safety, and the importance of appreciating her surroundings. The primary areas we use for these activities include, but is not limited to, the Van Buren area (more specifically the area by the bridge) up to Blue Springs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2490 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:22:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,  
I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve safety and access for road bicycling as well.

I oppose the no-action option, effectively continuing the ban on mountain biking on trails within the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has low environmental impact, will attract added visitors to the parks, and support economic growth in surrounding areas.



It has been my observation that mountain bikers in our area are particularly good stewards of land and coexist respectfully with other trail users. I believe that allowing mountain bikes in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will have a similar outcome and allow more people to enjoy this national treasure.

Sincerely,  
Nick Terhune  
Olathe, KS

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2491    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:22:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Leave current rules in place i.e. no changes. In addition we favor the return of this land to the state of Missouri via MO Dept. of Conservation.

Jeff Hartwig

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2492    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:28:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Leave the existing rules in place and MAKE NO CHANGES.

The changes proposed will harm the economic vitality of the region. For one example, restrictions on horseback trails will directly hurt local businesses who rely on that tourism.

Many of us here in Missouri want the Ozark Scenic Riverways removed from the jurisdiction of the National Park Service and instead returned to the State of Missouri. I have more faith and trust in our fiscally-responsible State managing the Park than our Federal government who recklessly overspends and is on the road to bankruptcy. Look at what happened to the National Parks and Monuments during the recent sequester. Is it possible that assets such as a park could be seized later by an international creditor? How can anyone put trust in a landlord who is trillions in debt?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2493    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:29:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

Not only is it appealing for visitors, but it is something that can attract and keep residents. The ability to use our bikes is something my family looks for in potential places of residence.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2494    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:30:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mountain bike is quiet and has a very low environmental impact.

Opening remote trails to mountain biking will expand peoples opportunity to enjoy the wilderness in a healthy, quiet and non damaging way.

Thank you for your consideration

David Frei

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2495    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:31:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2496    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:33:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As someone that travels to bike quite a bit and enjoys the many bike trails in Mark Twain forest, I encourage you to allow further biking in our great parks. MTBers bring revenue and traffic to our great parks and most importantly, are active in volunteering to create and maintain multiple use trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2497    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:33:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

I have spent thirty years in the bicycle business and encourage you to open access and create a fantastic destination state for cyclists.

Thank you,  
Mark Bendel

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2498    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:37:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** No action.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2499    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:42:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To whomever it may concern,

I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in central Missouri to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I strongly oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

The Mountain biking community, in general, is very conscious of the preservation of the environment and works tirelessly to build sustainable trail systems and to educate mountain bikers regarding the environment in which they practice their sport (for example the GORC organization in the St Louis area). Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

This part of Missouri is largely unexplored by a large population - providing bicycle access will open it up to exploration and enjoyment by a significant, and influential population.

Respectfully submitted,

William Cahill

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2500    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:43:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible. Mountain biking is an environmentally low impact activity, and mountain bikers such as myself, help maintain the natural environment and are advocates for its preservation.

Please try to keep my identifiable info out of the public sphere to the extent possible, without detracting from my support for opening the part to mountain biking.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2501    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:44:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I prefer the Alternative Use Plan that allows mountain bikes on designated trails. It would be best if some new trails were designed for beginning mountain bikers, like 1 or 2 mile single track loops, not too technical, with road access to attract novices.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2502    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:45:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** No changes to current rules. I favor the return of this land to the state of Missouri.

Mary Ann Hartwig

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2503    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:50:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support mountain biking and the increase of trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2504    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:52:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

I was really excited to read the draft plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways - in particular the possibility of opening up the area to mountain biking. My friends and I are avid mountain bikers and would definitely take trips to enjoy the beauty of this area if it were opened up to mountain bikes. We are very appreciative of the opportunity presented us to enjoy our parks and trail systems. We take time during our trips to move or cut downed trees after storms pass (I carry a small folding tree saw) and if we ever come across anything foreign we pick it up and dispose of it properly. When we travel to destinations like this we also spend money in support of the local economies by purchasing food, drinks, and gas.

So please put me down (and my buddies) as a resounding "yes" in support of allowing mountain biking on trails

within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

We also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible since we do that also!

Thanks!

Bob

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2505    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:52:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly recommend that you use plan A. I am fed up with smelly noisy atv's driven by city folk who bring their pollutions with them when they come. I want less hunting because I live in the forest where these week-end warriors come to prove there virility. We need canoes on the river but lets limit it to only the current canoe companies to have canoes on the river. Lets keep private canoes off the river and never allow motors on the river or in the forest..

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2506    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:52:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am associated with other groups that have submitted comments. This is my position so I will make this short and sweet.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) is one of Missouri's greatest national treasures and I am in support "Alternate B" of the proposed General Plan and the designation of the 3340-acres of wilderness near the Big Springs area of the park.

I encourage the NPS to stand firm in planning for the protection the natural resources of the ONSR and enhancing the visitor experience.

There will be cost associated with the new plan and the NPS must also address the fiscal demands to ensure that all anticipated programs can effectively be implemented by appropriating the necessary funds to sustain the park and associated natural resources in the future.

We enjoy the benefit of having one of the finest National Parks Systems in the world today and I commend National Parks Service (NPS) in its goal to further improve the design and management of the ONSR.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.....RC

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2507    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:54:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family and I believe the proposed changes are completely unnecessary and overkill. We support the no changes option or, in the alternative, turning the rivers over to the State of Missouri which will protect the rivers and, at the same time, allow common sense usage of them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2508    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:54:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** These are my personal comments, not representing any organization, but rather a user of the rivers for 50 years.

I personally favor Alternative A but support Alternative B only as a compromise. Otherwise I would call for lower horsepower limits on the Current River below Two Rivers. The upper Current River and Jacks Fork should be motor free (excepting emergencies). When I first floated the rivers nearly 50 years ago, motorboats were excessively rare

and restricted to the lower Current. I can well remember floating from Powder Mill to Big Spring in 1968 and seeing one powerboat (3.5 hp Mercury) in use. Otherwise, jon boats (wooden mostly) were propelled by paddle and pole. It is not true that motorboating is a traditional use on the rivers.

No motors above Two Rivers would mean that there would be 52 miles of motor-free Current River. That would leave 54 miles to the bottom end of the park with motors. Plus the section below the park to the Arkansas border would provide another 32 miles of motorized river. Keeping 52 miles of our first national river motor-free would be desirable.

The motorized boats and excessive vehicle access areas has nearly ruined the Riverways as a family camping experience. Relatively few people now camp along the rivers in the kind of passive recreation that went on for generations. It is rare, when camping, to get any kind of wilderness or quiet experience with jet boats and trucks visiting the area of your camp for a good part of the day and night.

Fewer motors in the Riverways would be a very good step toward re-establishing the qualities that made this area a national park in the first place.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2509    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:56:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is a very special area. First priority should be to protect it from further harm and save it for future generations. Money/income and "personal freedoms" should be given low priority. There must be limited access and other restrictions to the area as determined necessary by scientists in various fields of expertise (water quality, flora, fauna, geology etc). Please do your jobs and stop the destruction of this habitat.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2510    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:58:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Park Service,

As a long time user of the ONSR, I urge you to improve your management of this special place. The NPS's management of the ONSR in recent times has frankly been a major blemish on the reputation of your otherwise esteemed agency.

I urge you to enforce the scenic easements that exist on thousands of acres along the rivers. The NPS's failure to do so over the past 10 years has been a major embarrassment that has left permanent blemishes on the land.

I urge you to close all illegal roads in the ONSR and closely monitor the area to prevent any further incursions.

I urge you to work toward more responsible management of equestrian uses that balances their use with the need to protect natural resources and the experience of other park users.

I urge you to seek appropriations for continued acquisition of key parcels of land from willing sellers within the ONSR boundary.

Finally, I urge you to recommend designation of the Big Spring area as a formal Wilderness Area.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Edward J. Heisel

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2511    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:58:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** i would encourage the park service to select alternative "C". jim

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2512 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:58:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.  
I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.  
Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.  
[Include a few sentences about why allowing mountain biking and/or bicycling in general in these areas is important to you as a potential visitor to the area, to area tourism, etc.]

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2513 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:00:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I advocate ending the ban on mountain bicycling in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving paved roads to facilitate road cycling when feasible. Bicycling is an activity that offers many benefits, including improved health which is of increasing concern in America, and should be encouraged wherever possible.

I have camped and floated countless times in the Ozarks and enjoy the peace and quiet. Cycling would do nothing to detract from these qualities and would increase support for continued protection of the region.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2514 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:04:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly support the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Management Plan to help keep the rivers available and preserved for enjoyment of the people who love them.  
Thank you  
Audrey Wegst

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2515 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:04:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.  
I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.  
Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2516 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:06:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I frequently travel with my mountain bikes and kayaks, I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2517    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:06:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

I would be more likely to visit the Ozark National Scenic Riverways if I were able to mountain bike and road bike in the area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2518    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:07:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of allowing mountain bike riding on the trails, existing and proposed, that are part of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

Mountain bike riders as a whole are a very environmentally minded group.

Mountain bike riding has minimal impact to the trails, very similar to that caused by foot traffic.

Allowing mountain biking will definatly make the park more attractive to use for myself and my fellow bikers.

Thank you,

Dan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2519    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:09:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Current river is not just a natural resource, but a way of life for most people that live near it. Most of the people that live near the river work very hot, physical jobs and use the river as a way to relax. We spend thousands of dollars over the course of the summer going to the river. We pick up trash that is floating down the river. We make sure to leave things as we found it. We love OUR river. Please just leave things the way they are.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2520    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:09:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly support Option A. I believe that this option is the best one to preserve the wilderness aspects of these beautiful rivers.

My ability to canoe in peace, safely, is jeopardized by high horsepower PWC and boats creating large wakes and loud noise. I believe there are plenty of locations for these loud, invasive activities and that a National Park is not one of those.

I believe the NPS must get a better handle on the horse activities. Horses destroy trails. Limiting horses to sanctioned trails will help all of us.

Thank you.

gwd

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2521    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:12:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It has been my experience that multi use trails that allow Mountain Bike access are maintained better and offer the most enjoyment when I go hiking with the family. As a conservation minded citizen I appreciate the efforts by all the local outdoor cycling groups. Without there involvement many of the trails that we hike as a family would be overgrown and inaccessible. Please consider my opinion, and the needs of the trails when making your decision on whether to permit access to these trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2522    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:13:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** February 7, 2014

National Park Service  
Ozark National Scenic Riverways  
Superintendent Bill Black

Dear Superintendent Black:

I write in response to the ONSR Draft Management Plan. These remarks are personal, though I also endorse the comments offered by L-A-D Foundation and Pioneer Forest, Missouri Parks Association, and the Missouri Wilderness Coalition.

It has been deeply distressing to observe the deterioration of the Riverways since it was initially established by Congress in 1964. A leader of the citizen campaign that led to that legislation was Leonard Hall, of Caledonia, who was a personal friend of mine. His level of disappointment and distress become more and more severe, until his death some years ago. I offer these observations in memory and in honor of Len Hall. I also offer them in memory and honor of the Missourians whose lands were acquired, sometimes unwillingly, in order to create the Riverways. Their sacrifice cannot be forgotten, and must be respected.

There are many explanations for the deterioration of the Riverways, but it is apparent to me that the principal agent of that deterioration has been the increasing domination of the rivers and their valleys by motorized vehicles and watercraft. That domination has intruded into almost every area, onto virtually every gravel bar, and along every linear mile of the entire Riverways. There is now almost no secure escape anywhere on the entire Riverways from the sight of motorized vehicles and the sounds of loud motors. This is not what the Riverways was intended to provide, and no matter what is claimed by some, it is also not the traditional usage of the Rivers by local residents. These intrusions come at the expense of the peace and quiet of all non-motorized users, and also at the expense of the integrity of the natural resources the Riverways is supposed to protect.

Whatever the explanations for the failure to defend the Riverways, the long, sad pattern of assault and decline must at last be halted and reversed. This is clear from any reasonable interpretation of Public Law 88-492, and its subsequent amendments.

The best opportunity to address this is the Draft General Management Plan.

Although a case could be made for much stronger protection than is offered by any of the offered alternatives, it seems clear that Alternative B has been developed with an intention to provide a reasonable balance between resource protection and public access. Recognizing this intention, we endorse Alternative B as a minimal acceptable compromise that will address conflicting points of view in a responsible manner.

The vision of the founders of the Riverways, including Leonard Hall, and also the sacrifices of those whose farms and homes were taken to create the Riverways, demand that this exceptional resource be managed with the respect that it deserves.



Sincerely,

John Karel

cc: Missouri Congressional delegation  
Governor Jay Nixon  
Missouri conservation groups

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2523    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:20:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I hope an emphasis on banning any and all ATV/vehicle traffic on the banks and in the rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2524    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:27:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Superintendent Bill Black:

I have been a life long user of the Current River, and surrounding areas.  
I truly believe that continued use of motors on the river will ruin the  
beauty of this area for all generations to come.

I have floated this river from Top to Bottom, and believe that the  
people who use motors to patrol, and party these rivers are just plain  
lazy. Our forefathers had no other way up or down these rivers without  
the use of poles or paddles. If you are going to enjoy the beauty of the  
area,take the time to listen and learn what God has created.

Years ago, they limited the number of canoes that each livery could rent.  
That was a hog wash, more liveries were established. Which meant more  
crowds and over use of the area.

Ranger Bill Terry deserves a lot of credit for keeping the area protected  
from people who miss use the area, but he can't do it alone. Keep the motors  
off the river, and put more dedicated people in place. Real Simple

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2525    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:27:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails in the National Ozark Scenic Riverways area.  
Mountain biking is low impact but brings environmentally conscious, nature loving, active lifestyle people to the  
area to experience and utilize the resources respectfully. Furthermore, mountain bikers in Missouri are by far the  
most active group in trail maintenance and building, which benefits all users. The Ozark Trail Association and  
GORC (Gateway Off Road Cyclists) have done more in the past 10 years to maintain and build sustainable trails in  
Missouri than had been previously done by any group, in any time frame since the CCC in FRDs administration.

I do not support the "no action" option which will maintain banning mountain bike access.

Thank you for all you do to preserve, protect, and provide low impact access to the natural land treasures in our  
state.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2526    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:27:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** On behalf of Missouri Farm Bureau, the state's largest general farm organization, I submit the  
following comments regarding the Draft General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways

(ONSR). Based on concerns raised by many Farm Bureau members who live and work in the vicinity of the park, we support the No Action alternative.

Although many of our members participated in the recent public meetings and have submitted written comments, our organization was not among those notified by the National Park Service (NPS) of these meetings and other opportunities to provide input during the development of the draft plan. The notification mailing list provided by NPS pursuant to our request includes the Missouri Coalition for the Environment, Sierra Club, L.A.D. Foundation, Missouri Parks Association, American Rivers and The Nature Conservancy, but no organizations of comparable stature representing landowner interests. On a regulatory proposal with potentially significant ramifications for land use policy, we believe this was a serious oversight. At this point, we strongly urge the NPS to "level the playing field" by according proportionately more weight to views expressed by local residents.

We believe the No Action alternative is the least intrusive option in terms of property rights. We oppose the proposed wilderness designation and further restrictions on the use of park property as well as any restrictions that might affect the use of surrounding private property.

As suggested by numerous commenters, we urge the NPS to improve management under the existing general management plan in two ways. First, involve local citizens in seeking solutions to management problems and ongoing planning efforts. One commenter suggested reactivating a local advisory board. Second, focus enforcement resources where needed rather than adding new regulations that impose blanket restrictions. Budget constraints are likely to keep enforcement staffing shorthanded. Enforcement action that targets disruptive behavior rather than blanket restrictions that penalize more visitors makes sense not only from the standpoint of limited staffing but also fairness.

Compared to parks in more remote locations, further restricting access to this park would impact more park visitors. Reduced access would be especially adverse for those whose physical condition makes motorized access for hunting, fishing and other activities necessary. Such individuals would include a significant number of military service veterans and others locally for whom these activities are a cultural tradition and part of their lives since childhood. Furthermore, an aging population is likely to increase demand for motorized access.

The existing management plan can accommodate diverse uses of the park and at the same time provide for a positive experience for all. We urge the NPS to adopt the No Action alternative and work within its framework by targeting resources to address priorities identified with local input. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Blake Hurst

President, Missouri Farm Bureau

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2527    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:27:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** appreciate the attention given to and consideration for mountain biking and other trail uses within the General Management Plan, and urge you to give increased consideration for mountain biking in this and future plans. I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways. I urge you to allow mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in this and future plans, wherever possible and appropriate.

Well-designed mountain bike trails are sustainable and do not have adverse environmental impacts when properly constructed in the right locations. In fact, their environmental impact is often far lower than other trail options- -for instance, equestrian trails.

I feel that the current situation, with mountain biking disallowed on all existing trails and bicycling on area roads discouraged by the Scenic Riverways web page, does not allow visitors the full range of recreation options that are normally available at similar state and national parks across the nation. Allowing substantial mountain bike access in areas where it is appropriate would be a very important improvement in this area.

Missouri has a large and active mountain biking population that will very much use and appreciate these trails and access to this beautiful area, if it is provided.

I encourage you to involve bicycling and mountain biking groups when making decisions about trail access in the Scenic Riverways area

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2528    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:28:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a citizen of Missouri, and as one who appreciates the services provided by the National Park Service, I am writing to encourage adoption of Alternative B. I believe this option would best preserve one of our country's most beautiful natural waterways for future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2529    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:38:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I went on a self-guided float along the Current River a couple of years ago. It was simply amazing. The pristine natural environment with it's clean water, dramatic views, and diverse wildlife energized me for months, as it was the only trip I was able to take for a year! I look forward to a return trip this summer.

This river is a cultural and environmental icon in our state and should absolutely be protected and preserved with all resources - local, state, and federal, private, and public - available.

I support the Missouri Coalition For the Environment's efforts to protect and preserve this iconic, clean, and uplifting natural resource. Please use your power to keep this watershed a safe, clean, and protected area.

Thank you for your time,

Andy Heaslet

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2530    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:38:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on all trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition of mountain biking on all trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact, comparable to the impact from hiking and much less than that with equestrian use. Many times our family vacations are based around where we can enjoy mountain biking. We frequent trails in Missouri as well as in Colorado, Utah, North Carolina, Arkansas, Georgia, and numerous others. The mountain biking community cares deeply about the conditions of our trails and strives to keep them sustainable and pristine. There are few conflicts between riders and hikers- riders know to always give the right of way to any other trail users, as is always posted at trail heads. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors as well as to have a positive impact on the area economy. Many mountain bikers will travel several hours to ride a "good" trail and in turn will choose to spend the weekend in the area frequenting hotels, restaurants, campgrounds, etc. Many communities have benefited from this type of economic boost including Mountain View, AR (Syllamo Trail system), Warsaw, Mo, Bryson City, NC (Tsali Recreation Area/Trail system), as well as many others.

Your consideration is greatly appreciated.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2531    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:39:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hi - I'm wting to express my support to allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I would also support improvements to roads that would make them more friendly to road biking and bike transportation.

Cycling, including mountain biking, is of the most popular participation sports in our nation, and has a low

environmental impact. In fact I would argue that mountain biking has a positive enviromental impact because most mountain bikers I know are aware of issues that affect the sustainability of trails and try to avoid any negative impact to the trails. Also, from my experience mountain bikers tend to be one of the most, if not the most, active, knowledgeable, and skilled volunteer groups in building and mantaining sustainable trails.

I hope we as a people will say yes to expand cycling in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, which I believe is a yes to public health, happiness, and low-impact economic development.

Thank you,  
Ross Blanton, P.E.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2532    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:41:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I feel that the current situation, with mountain biking disallowed on all existing trails and bicycling on area roads discouraged by the Scenic Riverways web page, does not allow visitors the full range of recreation options that at normally available at similar state and national parks across the nation. Allowing substantial mountain bike access in areas where it is appropriate would be a very important improvement in this area.

Missouri has a large and active mountain biking population that will very much use and appreciate these trails and access to this beautiful area, if it is provided.

I encourage you to involve bicycling and mountain biking groups when making decisions about trail access in the Scenic Riverways area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2533    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:41:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Alternative B is a sound choice that balances sensitive ecological concerns with continued recreational access in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Designating almost all of the Big Springs Wilderness Study area as primitive will help to maintain upper-watershed quality, critical for downstream uses.

Protection of historic and Civilian Conservation Corps structures should be of priority as well, with access being of utmost importance, whether by road or trail.

Green infrastructure, like vegetated swales and wetlands to improve water quality and groundwater recharge, should be a part of any ecological restoration performed. Commercial forestry activities should be limited to minimal impact, with post-extraction necessary reforestation and comprehensive restoration part of any commercial contract.

Allocation of mountain biking on certain trails will increase the number of park visitors, with land impact equal or less than that of hikers and horseback riders and virtually zero water quality impact. At minimum, the Ozark Trail should be reassigned as multi-use in order to create a critical link for riders and hikers alike so that they may traverse the entire natural trail without detour.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2534    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:42:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support opening the trails of the Ozark Scenic Waterways Area to mountain bikers.

Thank You  
Patrick Kirkes

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2535    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:42:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** SUPPORT OZARK TRAIL

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2536    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:42:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am very much in support of opening up Mountain Bike trails in the Ozarks. In addition, I support upgrades in infrastructure on national roads to improve accessibility for cyclists to these new trails. I feel that cycling is a beneficial activity for communities and is a low-impact way to enjoy our national parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2537    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:44:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support opening the Ozark Scenic Waterways Area to mountain bikers. Having spent half my life living and mountain biking in Missouri I believe that this area is too valuable to all types of recreation to close it off to a low-impact form of recreation like mountain biking. Yes, contrary popular belief, mountain biking has a much lower impact on the environment than most people believe yet tends to be the first form of outdoor recreation omitted from management plans.

Thank you.

Ken Keister

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2538    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:44:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I travel to areas that have trails open to mountain bikes. These trips always provide support to local businesses for gas and food. Please allow cyclist access to these trails

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2539    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:46:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support opening the trails of the Ozark Scenic Waterways Area to mountain bikers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2540    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:46:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly support plan or proposition B mainly because i don't think plan A would have a chance of passing. The park service has done a wonderful job putting the plans together. My understanding is that if the original plans years ago had been implemented and enforced in the first place we wouldn't be in this position of trying to save our beautiful stream now. With the over abundance of river accesses and motorized vehicles and horses and bacteria in the water the pleasure of a safe natural experience is threatened to say the least. Help! Plan B seems to be a well thought out compromised. If it passes I hope it will be strongly enforced.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2541    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:47:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I think that the No Action Plan is what should be put in place. If the Park Service would enforce the rules, regulations, and laws that are already in place the problems on the riverways would be controlled. Even though ONSR is a National Park, the local residents should have rights. We don't have any say about National Parks across the country. Why should citizens from afar have so much pull when making decisions about our heritage and way of life. The local people DO take care of the river. For the small number of people who lack respect for the river enforcing the current rules, regulations, and laws would take care of the problem. We use the river regularly from May until September and will generally only see a Ranger in a watercraft twice a year. Again, the No Action Plan along with enforcement of current rules, regulations, and laws would be the best option for everyone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2542 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:47:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

When selecting a destination to visit having mountain bike trails makes it more appealing for me. I prefer the less touristy options and mountain biking does just that. Enjoy the scenery and see the countryside from bike. A much better option!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2543 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:52:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe the park service is doing a good job considering the physical layout of the park, though I have some concerns regarding the future of this biologically diverse area. After reading the GMP and considering the options, I'm leaning towards option A, but I can see Option B being an improvement as well. The protestations of locals have been interesting to say the least and seem to reflect our current political climate. That's not to say it does not reflect the unique history of this area and it's people - they do have some historical grounds for a mistrust of federal government. As a long time visitor to the park and a property owner in Shannon County, I feel I have a balanced view of the situation. Yet and still, the preservation of the rivers for the future should be the ultimate goal here, regardless of who might get their pride bruised. We, as humans - with all our inherit flaws - need to think long term, rather than just for tomorrow. The human impact in this region has been profound, the logging around the turn of the century in particular. That brings into perspective just how short of a time period humans have even been in this area and just how much damage can be done in that short amount of time. Of course, now we have many scientific tools to analyze all aspects of the environment and quantify the results. The analysis all points to human activity as the leading detriment. The GMP contains quite a bit of this analysis, and the park service should be highly commended on these detailed studies. These, as well as the American Rivers assessment of a few years ago, starkly illustrate just how fragile this environment is. Quite literally, this is a national treasure in nearly every sense of the term. That said, recreation should be our least concern in our long range planning, though it IS a concern. People need to be able to enjoy it. From what I've seen on the rivers in recent years, they enjoy it a little too much...as in all out party time. Enforcement on the river is a challenge, I understand, but it's crucial. I cannot even begin to count the number of cans, trash, and other debris I've picked up in and along the rivers over the years. Of course I either recycled or properly disposed of these items. Having seen the sheer disregard by human visitors, it's no wonder some people have vastly differing opinions about these options, though I cannot imagine their thought process in leaving trash in such a place.

Ultimately this is about the rivers, not about the people currently living near them. Humans will come and go over generations, but the rivers and their unique biodiversity must be preserved, and hopefully improved, for the responsible enjoyment of many generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2544 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:53:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please allow Mountain Bike riders to ride on the Ozark Scenic Waterway trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2545 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:53:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No Action Plan.

Enforce the rules and laws that are already in place.

Let the local people keep their heritage and way of life.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2546    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:53:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Director Jarvis,

I join with American Rivers and Friends of Ozark Riverways in supporting the National Park Service's Preferred Alternative B for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan, which provides for redistribution of uses to minimize conflict, restoration of degraded areas, and more staff for maintenance, monitoring, and enforcement, while substantially enhancing visitor experience of park resources.

In the Riverways, unauthorized roads, overuse by all-terrain vehicles, and excessive equestrian use in sensitive areas have contributed to degradation, including increased bank erosion, more sediment in the water, reduced habitat quality, and unsafe bacteria levels in certain river stretches. Re-directing high impact activities to areas where damage is minimized, allowing damaged areas to heal, establishing levels of use that enable the rivers to maintain quality, and organizing activities with respect for the natural and cultural resources are the keys to stewardship of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

Sincerely,

Aaeron Robb, MD  
Aaron Ucko, DC  
Adeline Ladoue, Greece  
Adriana Beckman, AZ  
Al Bradley, IL  
Alan Rosa, CA  
Aleks Kosowicz, WI  
Aleksander Lindemann, NY  
Aleksandra Biedron, NJ  
Alessandro Raganato, Canada  
Alex Betser, NY  
Alex DiRenzo, OH  
Alexander Zavradinov, Greece  
Alexandra D. Pappano, ME  
Alexis Pagoulatos, NJ  
Alicia Zody, IL  
Aline Rosenzweig, TX  
Allan Yorkowitz, NJ  
Allison Acker, MO  
Alyssa Webb, PA  
Amber Joy, WA  
Ambrey Nichols, CO  
Amitav Dash, Canada  
Amy Leigh Garland, GA  
Ana Santamaria, CO  
Andrea Vazquez, ND  
Andrew Kaplan, FL  
Andy Coursey, IL  
Angel Moreno, NJ  
Angela Fazzari, OR  
Angie Harrell, MO  
Angie Williams, CA  
AniMaeChi Drabic, CA  
Anita Goncalves, MA  
Ann Bergmann, CT

Ann Breeden, ME  
Ann Coz, MA  
Ann Sandritter, NJ  
Ann Speichinger, IL  
Anna Louise E. Fontaine, Canada  
Anna Trzebiatowska  
Anne Hussar, KS  
Anne Jackson, PA  
Anne-Marie Mitchell  
Annie Laurie, MA  
Anthony Ivankovic, NJ  
Anthony Montapert, CA  
Antina Schmidt  
Anton Feokhari, NY  
Arielle Bernstein, CA  
Arlene Patoray, NJ  
Arlene Zimmer, CA  
Ashleigh Neale, WA  
Ashley Heffner, PA  
Astrid Keup  
Aubrey Guilbault, MI  
Audrey Mannolini, CA  
Audrey Tillinghast, NC  
B. Lloyd, KY  
Babs Marchand, FL  
Barb Horban, IN  
Barbara Boros, CA  
Barbara Clarke, MI  
Barbara Gibson, PA  
Barbara Mathes, AZ  
Barbara Silvia Calamai  
Barbara Vieira, NY  
Ben Arnold, FL  
Ben Ruwe, CA  
Bernard Waxman, MO  
Bernardo Alayza Mujica, IA  
Beth Butler, MO  
Betty Ford, VA  
Betty Kelly, VA  
Bill Herman, CA  
Birgit Walch, Canada  
Bo H., IL  
Bob Bousquet, MA  
Bob Haugen, MN  
Brad Franklin, CA  
Bradley Rigdon, TX  
Brandie Deal, WA  
Brant Kotch, TX  
Brian Brown, PA  
Brian Paradise, FL  
Brian Poole  
Brian Thompson, CA  
Brian Yanke, WI  
Bridget Robertson, TX  
Bridgett Heinly, CA  
Brody Hagemeier, MN



Bronwen Evans, WA  
Bruce Abbott, DE  
Bruce Sowden  
Bruno Prata  
Bruno Ribeiro  
Bryna Pizzo, MO  
C. K., WI  
Camila Cossio, TX  
Candace Jarrett, NV  
Candace Keane, MN  
Candice Lowery, NY  
Carlene Steel, TX  
Carol Changus, CA  
Carol Collins, DE  
Carol Gold, CA  
Carol Grimes, MO  
Carol Hill, SC  
Carol Jurczewski, IL  
Carol Klamerus, AZ  
Carol Smith, IL  
Carol White, MT  
Carole Pooler, IL  
Caroline Gray, MO  
Carolyn Riddle, TX  
Cate Kager, PA  
Catherine Becsky, Canada  
Cathy Brownlee, AR  
Cathy Burger, MD  
Cecilie Davidson  
Celia Michener, IL  
Charlene Rush, PA  
Charles Alexander, MD  
Charles J. Whittle Jr., VA  
Charles Jaco, MO  
Cherie Tindale, Canada  
Cheryl Rigby, MA  
Cheryl Young, TX  
Chris Drumright, TN  
Chris Hunter, LA  
Chris Jones, OK  
Chris Winkley, TX  
Christi Dillon, NC  
Christina Bernard, VA  
Christina Marcus, NY  
Christine DiSimone, CA  
Christine Lemke, MI  
Christine Schneebeil  
Christine Seyer, MO  
Christine Stokely, MO  
Christopher Lane, SC  
Christopher Panayi  
Chuck Clarke, VT  
Cindy Risvold, WI  
Cinzia Caporali  
Claudia Correia  
Clotilda G. Devlin, NJ

Colleen Lobel, CA  
Connie Raper, NC  
Cortney Zaret, IL  
Craig Brewer, MO  
Craig Pence, IL  
Craig Schaffer, NV  
Curzio Bruni  
Cyndy White  
Cynthia Murphy, FL  
Cynthia Patterson, GA  
D. Orellana, OH  
D. Singer, CA  
Dale Geiler, MO  
Dale Goldstein, NY  
Dale Riehart, CA  
Dale Westwood  
Dan McCurdy, IL  
Dan Nickerson, CA  
Dana Kerstein, FL  
Daniel Mink, PA  
Daniel Puetz, IL  
Daniel Soulas  
Daniel Tham  
Daniel Wilkinson, CA  
Danielle Tran, AL  
Danielle White, CA  
Danuta Watola  
Darlene Jakusz, WI  
Darynne Jessler, CA  
Dave Loiselle, NC  
David A. Smith, CA  
David Bigwood  
David Ferger, MI  
David Grimes, AK  
David Land, MD  
David Larson, PA  
David Moryc, OR  
David Peery, MO  
David Soares, CA  
David Yoder, TN  
Dawn Albanese, IL  
Dawn Freeman, ME  
Dawn Odonnell, NY  
Debbie Alderson, IN  
Debbie Biere, MO  
Debbie McCarthy, ME  
Debbie Moore, MA  
Debbie Sequichie-Kerchee, OK  
Debbie Sisk, KS  
Debbie Williamson, AR  
Deborah Gorman, NY  
Deborah Smith, OK  
Debra Gakeler, KS  
Debra Greenberg, CA  
Debra Tate, FL  
Deja Lizer, NC

Delia Mihaela Papa  
Denise Brennan, MI  
Denise Pedersen, UT  
Dennis Feichtinger, MI  
Dennis McGee Jr., IL  
Deo Schlupp, CO  
Desiree Johnson, MA  
Dian Berger, ID  
Diana Dee, CA  
Diana Kliche, CA  
Diane Burgin  
Diane Fitzgerald, NY  
Diane Houle, CT  
Dianna Mullen, NE  
Dianne Douglas, AZ  
Dogan Ozkan, AK  
Dominic Giles  
Dominic Giles  
Don McKelvey, OH  
Don McKelvey, OH  
Dona Upson, NM  
Donna Carr, M.D., CA  
Donna Dale, MO  
Donna Hamilton  
Donna Janusko, PA  
Donna Janusko, PA  
Donna Selquist, FL  
Donna Towne, ID  
Dorinda Kelley, OR  
Doris Munger, CT  
Doris Warnstedt  
Dorothea Stephan  
Doug Krause, ND  
Doug Wagener, MO  
Douglas Brown, MO  
Douglas Reineri, MO  
Dru Ann Delgado, PA  
Duane Baker, OH  
Dunja Moeller, MA  
Dusty Stepanski, NJ  
Ed Atkins, CA  
Ed Carawan, MO  
Ed Vieira, NY  
Edeltraut Renk, Italy  
Edgar Davis, MO  
Edith Coleman, DE  
Edward Butler, NY  
Edward Hanson, CO  
Edward Shelley, OR  
Egli-Steinegger Veronika  
Eileen Thomson  
Elaina Lindsey, MO  
Elaine Bbye-Groeschl, WI  
Elaine Donovan, NY  
Elaine Larson, CA  
Elaine Rizzo, IL

Eleonora Pavlovska  
Elias Torstensson  
Elinor Hawke-Szady, Canada  
Elisabeth Noty, IL  
Elisabeth Richter  
Elizabeth Charney, MO  
Elizabeth Hale, AZ  
Elizabeth Mitchell, AL  
Elizabeth O'Connor, HI  
Eliza-Jane Dylan, CO  
Ella Reeves  
Ellen Atkinson, NV  
Ellen Kent, VA  
Ellen McConnell, NJ  
Ellen Sharkey, IL  
Emilia Boccagna  
Emily Kessler, CA  
Emily Moffatt, TN  
Emma Spurgin Hussey, CO\  
Enzo Mulas, Italy  
Eric Edwards, IL  
Eric Stordahl, MI  
Erika Miller, MO  
Erin Gregoire, NH  
Erin Swanson  
Ewa Kuczenska  
Faye Soares, CA  
Felix Fusco, NY  
Filiz Selman, NY  
Fiona Priskich, CA  
Frances Blythe, CA  
Frances Darcy  
Frances Goff, CA  
Frances Mead, WA  
Francis Scheuer, FL  
Franklin Platizky, TX  
Franshisca Dearmas, FL  
Fred Fall, NJ  
Fred Lih, NC  
Frederic Michalski  
G. L. Hicks, IL  
G. M.  
Gail Yborra, DE  
Gary Thaler, MA  
Gene Lawson, WA  
George Heritier, MI  
George Latta, CA  
George Stadnik, NY  
George Stiimpson, Canada  
German Mendez, FL  
Gessy van der Loo  
Giana Peranio Paz, NC  
Gina Gatto, CA  
Ginger Brewer, FL  
Ginger Hill, SC  
Gjorgji Dzolev

Gloria Howard, AZ  
Grace Neff, OR  
Grace Payne, TX  
Gracie Winters, OK  
Graciela Tasende  
Grant Campbell, FL  
Greg Baumgart, MO  
Gregory Swenson  
Gregory Wood, OH  
Gretchen Hanger, MN  
Grete Solg  
Guy Bateman, MT  
Gwendolyn Mehring, FL  
H. Guh, TX  
H. Kirk, HI  
Hal Trufan, NC  
Hannah Freed, CA  
Hannah Goebig, IL  
Hartson Doak, HI  
Harvey Buchbinder, CA  
Heather Payne, NC  
Heather Sorensen, ND  
Heather Turbush, NY  
Heidi Krouskup, AZ  
Heidi Ludwick, NE  
Henry Rohrs, MO  
Hester Goedhart, CA  
Hilary Capstick, FL  
Ian Shelley, OR  
Ilaria Alunni, Italy  
Ilene Kazak, MI  
Ilya Turov, CA  
Inge Bjorkman  
Irmgard Gutersohn, TX  
Isabelle Boisgard  
Isabelle Yao, HI  
Izabella Dabrowski, TX  
J. Weil, CO  
Jack Steinberg, FL  
Jacqueline Newman, KY  
James Bess, MI  
James Deshotels, MO  
James Dixon, WV  
James Mickle, CA  
James Ohlweiler, OH  
James Thompson  
James Wolcott, IN  
Jan Cotton, LA  
Jan Modjeski, SC  
Jana Brown, MA  
Jane Beattie, ID  
Jane Hope, KY  
Janeene Porcher, CO  
Janet Falcone, KY  
Janet Forman  
Janet Maker

Janet Neihart, MN  
Janet Olson, MN  
Jan-Paul Alon, NJ  
Jared Cornelia, DE  
Jared Windus, MA  
Jean LeJeune, MO  
Jean Thornsby, WA  
Jeanette Davis, NY  
Jeanie Streit, CA  
Jeanne Mackay, MI  
Jeanne Peters  
Jeanne Schreurs  
Jeannette Ernst  
Jeff Brown, MO  
Jeff Clawges, MO  
Jeff Hopkins, IL  
Jeff Komisarof, MD  
Jeffrey Kopp, MO  
Jeffrey Krueger, MO  
Jennifer Armstrong, AK  
Jennifer Claunch-Meyers, WI  
Jennifer DiRenzo, MO  
Jennifer Lowans, PA  
Jennifer Nitz, MT  
Jennifer Scott, FL  
Jennifer Valentine, NY  
Jeri Pollock, Canada  
Jerry Golde, IL  
Jessica Brown, IN  
Jessie Thomas-Blate, VA  
Jill Crouch, CO  
Jim Snee, VT  
Jinger Pulkrabek, MN  
Jo Ann McNaughton-Kade, IL  
Joan Breiding, CA  
Joan McAllister  
Joanna Dziamba  
Joanne Hesselink, WI  
Jocelyn Schuh, MO  
Joe Morrissey, NY  
Joe Pruessner, KS  
Joe Renneke, MN  
Joel Frye, FL  
Joel Maguire, RI  
Joel Perkins, TX  
Johanna Elias, NY  
John Aaron, DC  
John Beaven  
John Belleville, MO  
John Brewer, OH  
John Cort, CO  
John Crotty, MO  
John Dierig, OH  
John Frey, MA  
John Hammel, TN  
John Lemaux

John Limbach, WI  
John Niendorf, WA  
John Oda, CA  
John Pinezich, CO  
John Pranke, IL  
John Richkus, NJ  
John Rokas, MI  
John Romano, MO  
John Schuh, MO  
John Whitaker, NC  
Jon Gordon, NY  
Jon Levin, PA  
Jon Nelson, NY  
Joni Chudomelka, MO  
Jose Noya, NC  
Joseph Harris, OH  
Joseph Hewgley, AR  
Joseph Quirk, NY  
Joseph Spinelli 3rd, PA  
Joseph Wenzel, MN  
Josh Schuh, MO  
Joy Burns, KS  
Joy Zadaca, CA  
Joyce Coe, MI  
Joyce Coogan, CO  
Joyce Frohn, WI  
Joyce Schwartz, FL  
Judi Fusco, NY  
Judith Abel, MI  
Judith Busse, NY  
Judith Frey, NY  
Judith Hazelton, VT  
Judith Platz, IA  
Judith Ponder, OR  
Judy Moran, FL  
Judy Poole  
Judy Talamantes, CA  
Julia Caspar, NJ  
Julia Westbrook  
Julie Griffith, IL  
Julie Sasaoka, CA  
Julie Solomonson, MN  
Julie Thacker, AR  
June Linhart, NC  
Junko Card, CA  
K. N., NY  
Kairen Brooke-Anderson  
Kally Coleman, MO  
Karen Berger, CA  
Karen Naiman, CO  
Karen Palmer, RI  
Karen Salzgeber, OH  
Karen Stickney, ME  
Karen Toyohara, CA  
Karen Trearchis, MA  
Karin Ralph, NY

Karlene Gunter, NY  
Karol Bryan, FL  
Karola Windweh  
Kate K., Greece  
Kate Kenner, MA  
Katherine Kautz, CO  
Katherine Seyer, MO  
Kathleen Acker, MO  
Kathleen Doyle, CO  
Kathleen Keske, NY  
Kathleen Ruiz, CA  
Kathleen Smaluk-Nix, KY  
Kathrina Spyridakis, MI  
Kathryn Chouinard, CO  
Kathryn Lemoine, LA  
Kathryn Rose, CO  
Kathy Dabanian, PA  
Kathy Rapp, MO  
Katia Scaglia  
Katie Ruiz, MD  
Kay Moore, ID  
Keith Kohler, MO  
Keith LaPointe, MI  
Keli Myers, SC  
Kelsey Baker, CA  
Kenneth Nahigian, CA  
Kenneth Robertson, MO  
Kenton Barnes, MI  
Kerry Vootervan, MO  
Kevin Branstetter, CA  
Kevin Darcy, WA  
Kevin Orme, WA  
Kevin Petty, AZ  
Kimberly Wiley, NY  
Kit Blumenstein, TX  
Kristen Lowry, CA  
Kristin Cook, MD  
Kristin Green, MI  
Krystal Weilage, MT  
Kurtis Schultz, WA  
Kyle Chidester, CA  
Larry Kuenker, MO  
Larry Lambeth, MO  
Larry Machado, NV  
Larry Olivier, TN  
Laura Higgins, MO  
Laura Krause, FL  
Laura Ricci, NY  
Laura Salanitro  
Laura Staples, FL  
Laura Toussaint, France  
Laurie Sudol, AZ  
Lawrence Crowley, CO  
Lea Mac Leod, NY  
Lea Tolley, IN  
Lee Graham, MI



Lee O'Brien, CO  
Leigh Saunders, HI  
Lenore Reeves, IL  
Leona Klerer, CT  
Leslie Calambro, VA  
Leslie Tawnamaia, VT  
Lillyan Cendejas, CA  
Linda Bescrypt  
Linda Chase, CO  
Linda Isbell  
Linda Jones, CA  
Linda Mooney, AZ  
Linda Peterson, NC  
Linda Staelens  
Linda Stoltz  
Linda Townill, IL  
Lindsey Densing, TX  
Lindsey Gray, TN  
Linette Schreiber, PA  
Lisa Barrett, IL  
Lisa Gee, CA  
Lisa Goldman, SC  
Lisa L., NJ  
Lisa Neste, NC  
Lisa Pedersen  
Lisa Stone, TX  
Liu Wai Ling, GA  
Liz Garratt, NY  
Liz Godber  
Lois Jordan, AZ  
Lora Evans, PA  
Lorenz Steininger  
Lorna Wallach, FL  
Lorraine Caputo, MO  
Lorraine Lowry, CA  
Lorraine Sandstrom, MO  
Lou Baxter, VI  
Luciana González, Spain  
Lydia Tanenhaus, IA  
Lyle Collins, WA  
Lynn Barron, IL  
Lynn Elliott, NC  
Lynn Krell, MS  
Lynn Roebuck, AR  
Lynne Adrian, AL  
M. Leszczynski, MI  
Ma. Elena Guillermo  
Magali Feugier  
Maggie Adrian, CA  
Maggie Jahn, WA  
Maia Tagami, MO  
Malin Bengtsson, CA  
Marcia Clarke, WA  
Marco Pardi, GA  
Marcus Lindstrom, AK  
Marek Olszewski

Margaret Runfors  
Margareta Car  
Maria dels Àngels Beltran, Canada  
Maria Martins  
Maria Rausis, CA  
Maria Reis  
Maria Sagrario Barrio Estebanz  
Maria Valdemí, NY  
Marie-Paule Vanderhoeft  
Marika Runfors, OR  
Marilyn Egan, FL  
Marilyn Evenson, WA  
Marjorie Hass, OK  
Mark Boyajian, MA  
Mark Canright, NJ  
Mark Dailey  
Mark Donaldson, FL  
Mark Feldman, CA  
Mark Glasser, CA  
Mark M Giese, WI  
Mark Mazhnyy, CA  
Mark Peltz, NY  
Marla de Vries, Germany  
Marsha Adams, WA  
Martha Milne, FL  
Martha W D Bushnell, CO  
Martin Horwitz, CA  
Mary Anne Joyce, OR  
Mary Bailey, MO  
Mary Barbezat, IL  
Mary Catherine Bunting, MD  
Mary Garcia, OR  
Mary Perlick, IL  
Mary Price, OK  
Mary Reed, TN  
Mary Thomas, CA  
Mary Traywick, NC  
Mary True, HI  
Mary Webb, OH  
MaryAnn Burch, NY  
Matt Johnson, MN  
Matt Whitaker, MO  
Matthew Bessler, MO  
Matthieu Brillet, MI  
Maud van Tol  
Maureen Lynch, NY  
Maureen O'Neal, OR  
Mauricio Carvajal, ME  
Max Smith, NY  
Maya Kurtz, CO  
Meg Gilman, NH  
Megan Adams, CA  
Megan Fanion, CT  
Melinda Bashen, VA  
Melinda Dastrup, UT  
Melissa Fleming, MA

Melissa Hillen, WV  
Meryl Pinque, ME  
Meya Law, MD  
Michael Adams, MO  
Michael Baffa, CT  
Michael E. Mizell, TX  
Michael Hammond, PA  
Michael Murphy, NY  
Michael Olenjack, MO  
Michael Pennington, AZ  
Michael Ray, CT  
Michael Riley, MA  
Michael W Evans, CA  
Michaëlle Robardey, LA  
Michel Croquet  
Michele Temple, NY  
Michelle Hoff, PA  
Michelle Lee, NC  
Michelle Lenz, IL  
Michelle Oroz, CA  
Mickey McKain, NY  
Mike Vanlandingham, KS  
Milca Van Den Steene, MA  
Mitchell Grossman, CA  
Molly Schminke, CA  
Mona Granback  
Monica Drake, TX  
Monica Gilman, OR  
Monika Huber  
Monique Musialowski, MI  
Montserrat Alvarez, MA  
Muriel Servaege  
Naho Sakamoto  
Nancy Black, MO  
Nancy Enos, FL  
Nancy Hediger, IL  
Nancy Higgins, MO  
Nancy White, WA  
Natalie Van Leekwijck, OR  
Natasha Salgado, MD  
Nathan Prugh, OK  
Nathan Schaefer, NH  
Nathaniel Chambers, AR  
Nayeem Aslam, IL  
Nick Barcott, WA  
Nicole Shaffer, CO  
Nicole Strathmann, MO  
Noah-D.M. Sanchez, FL  
Norma Laborie, IL  
Nuria Vergara  
O. Ruiz, NJ  
Olivier Desport  
Omar Siddique, MD  
Oscar Revilla, MA  
Pablo Llobera  
Pam Belleville, MO

Panagiotis Rigopoulos  
Pat Johnson, OH  
Patrcia Taboga  
Patrice Johnson, TX  
Patrice Summers, CA  
Patricia Austin-Puccio, CT  
Patricia Chelmecki, IL  
Patricia Daniels, VA  
Patricia Jacques Fernandes  
Patricia Kaiser  
Patricia Klos, MO  
Patricia Nazzaro, KY  
Patricia Perron, WA  
Patricia Phillips, OH  
Patricia Siri, IN  
Patricia Vazquez  
Patricia Velez, PA  
Patrick Lord, MO  
Patrick Rakes, TN  
Patrick Vogelsong, PA  
Patrizia Morano, Italy  
Paul Downing, OH  
Paul Goyetche, MA  
Paul Henry, MA  
Paul Moss, MN  
Paul Steffen, IN  
Paul Sullivan, CT  
Paula Eppler, OR  
Paula Golden, AR  
Paula Shafransky, WA  
Pedro Rodriguez, FL  
Peggy Powell, RI  
Penni Norman, IA  
Peter Hagerty, OH  
Philip Simon, CA  
Phillip Anderton  
Phyl Morello, TN  
Pilar Thoms, TX  
Polly Dross, MO  
Rachael Pappano, ME  
Rachel Cilley, NH  
Rachel Leip, MO  
Randall Nord, VA  
Raun Norquist  
Rayn Jacks, OR  
RB Archer, CO  
Rebecca Frey, CA  
Red Lih, NC  
Refhan Irtem, NY  
Reidun Carstens  
Rev. Gordon Hills, OH  
Reynaldo Reyna, TX  
Rho Andrae-Lawford, IL  
Ricardo Hernandez  
Richard Dimatteo, CA  
Richard E Cooley, NM

Richard Harris, TN  
Richard Meininger, CA  
Richard Moore, CA  
Richard Stern, NY  
Rikje Maria Ruiter  
Riley Canada II, GA  
Rio Walters, AR  
Rita Uljee  
Roaux Aline, France  
Robert Altom, MI  
Robert Chirpin, CA  
Robert Foley Jr, MA  
Robert Haslag, MO  
Robert Holm, MO  
Robert Janusko, PA  
Robert Janusko, PA  
Robert Krikourian, CA  
Robert McManus, MN  
Robert Orlando, NY  
Robert Peters, CO  
Robert Poe, MO  
Robert Rutkowski, KS  
Robert Shippee, VA  
Robert Sothern, MN  
Robert Turrentine, MO  
Robert Wallace, CA  
Robert Wood, NJ  
Robert Yancey, IL  
Robert Zank, MA  
Roberta Claypool, IN  
Roberta Wagner, NJ  
Robin Newberg  
Robin Newberg  
Robin Peterson, CA  
Robyn Cleaves, WA  
Rogers Turrentine, CA  
Rolando Arango, CA  
Rollin Blanton, CA  
Ron Knaub, MO  
Ronald Carns, PA  
Ronald Maxson, CA  
Ronda Snider, WA  
Rosemary Busterna, CO  
Rosemary French, NV  
Rosiris Paniagua, CA  
Ross Wright, SD  
Roy Jones, MN  
Russell Donnelly, MD  
Russell Weisz, CA  
Ruth Johnston, WI  
Ruth Rogers, CO  
Ruth Serra, FL  
Ryan Hanlon, MO  
S Thebeau, SC  
S. Etherton, NY  
S. Logan, FL

S. Lowe, FL  
S. Thebeau, SC  
Sally Purbrick-Illek, OR  
Samantha Maffeo, IL  
Samantha Rich, WA  
Samuel Durkin, CA  
Sandi Walters, AR  
Sandra Arapoudis  
Sandra Ard, MO  
Sandra Blackburn, CA  
Sandra Couch, IL  
Sandra Maddox, NC  
Sandra Materi, WY  
Sandra Wood, OH  
Sandra Woodall, TX  
Sandy Bihn, OH  
Sara Paoluzzi, France  
Scott Coryell, MO  
Sean Corrigan, CA  
Sean King, MD  
Sharon Byrd-Mackbee, GA  
Sharon Lebon, PA  
Sharon Lee, OR  
Sharon Wakefield, IL  
Shaun Woodson, VA  
Shawnda Schwartz, OH  
Sheila Dillon, MN  
Sheila Nichols, MO  
Sheila Ward, PR  
Sherri Gillespie, CA  
Sherrill Futrell, CA  
Sherry Bogan, OH  
Sherry Owens, TN  
Sheryl Becker, MA  
Silvana Comacchio, Italy  
Silvana Zelmanovich, CA  
Sofia Karvouna  
Sonya Myers, FL  
Sophia Bicoy, TX  
Stacey Calvert  
Stacey Cannon, NC  
Stacey Skole, NY  
Stacy Christiansen, OK  
Stacy Grossman, OH  
Stanley Pully, TX  
Stefano Sgreccia  
Stephanie Cuellar, NY  
Stephanie Falkowski, NJ  
Stephen Newberg  
Stephen Snead, MO  
Steve Sugarman, CA  
Steve Wanninger, IL  
Steven Brewer, MO  
Steven Heffley, IN  
Steven J. Prince  
Steven Kostis, NY

Sue Jackson, Canada  
Sue Shulman, IL  
Sue Velez, NJ  
Summer Stetzik, OH  
Suneet Srivastava, Canada  
Susan Babbitt, PA  
Susan Carey, NY  
Susan Denner, MO  
Susan Dorchin, FL  
Susan Glasser, CA  
Susan Thuraiaratnam, GA  
Suzanne Hamer, WA  
Suzanne Parker, MO  
Suzanne Zook, OR  
Sylvie Auger  
Sylvie Bantle  
Sylvie Carpentier  
T. C., IL  
T. Faase, CA  
T. Garmon, GA  
Tami Palacky, VA  
Tanya Selth  
Tara Verbridge, MI  
Tatiana Torres, CA  
Ted Williams, TX  
Tereza Marins, Spain  
Terrance Hutchinson, CA  
Terri Barreras, IL  
Terry Flanagan, CA  
Terry Tedesco-Kerrick, AZ  
Theresa Vogt, MO  
Thierry Favre  
Thomas Dorsey, MA  
Thomas Keane, NY  
Thomas Malkowicz, MO  
Tiffany Caldwell, MS  
Timothy Larkin, CA  
Tina Brenza, IL  
Todd Fisk, CA  
Todd Kahovec, MI  
Tom Sanchez, CA  
Tom Tamplin, Canada  
Toni Caldwell-Clark, KS  
Toni Siegrist, MA  
Tony Marra, FL  
Tracey Eakin, PA  
Twyla Meyer, CA  
Tye Block, SC  
Vailios Gikas, PA  
Valeria Bonfiglio  
Valerie Friedman, FL  
Valerie Hildebrand, OH  
Vasilios Gikas, PA  
Vera Sadkovsky  
Vercknocke Pascal  
Veronica Gonzalez, NY

Veronica Poade  
Veronica R Koch, OH  
Vic Bostock, CA  
Vickey Baker, IA  
Vicki Kruschwitz, TX  
Victoria Fleenor, OH  
Victoria Moore, AL  
Victoria Pitchford, IL  
Viki Rambo, AZ  
Vince Mendieta, TX  
Virgene Link, WA  
Virgil Pauls, MN  
Vittorio Ricci  
Wally Eastman, NV  
Walt Kleine, CA  
Walter Stokely, MO  
Wanda Allen, NH  
Warren Snyder, CO  
Wayne Langston, MO  
Wayne Middleton  
Wendi Cohen, NY  
Wendy F., MA  
Wendy Weldon, FL  
Wilbur Little, CO  
William C Briggs Jr, CA  
William Toner, NY  
William Whitaker, CO  
Wylie Cox, UT  
Xavier Petit  
Yseult Biwer, CA  
Yvonne Barker, WI  
Yvonne Irvin, MD  
Zach McDonald, MO

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2547    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:55:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No Action Plan.

Enforce the laws.

Leave the local culture alone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2548    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:57:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** In general, I support allowing mountain biking on all trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition of mountain biking on all trails within the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact, comparable to the impact from hiking and much less than that with equestrian use. The trails I frequent here in Missouri (as well as in Colorado, Utah, North Carolina, Arkansas, Georgia, and numerous others) that are multi-use are always better maintained than single use trails. The mountainbiking community cares deeply about the conditions of our trails and strive to keep them sustainable and pristine. There are few conflicts between riders and hikers- riders know to always give the right of way to any other



trail users, as is always posted at our trail heads. Multi-use trails provide the most good for the most people, a main goal of the Ozark Riverways.

Also of note is the huge economic impact communities see when trail systems are opened to mountain biking. Areas like the Syllamo trail system in Mountain View, AR, the Tsali Recreation Area near Bryson City, NC, trails in Bentonville, AR, Moab, UT, and Fruita, CO to name a few- all have seen an enormous influx of tourism dollars due to mountain biking. Creating these opportunities in the area will make our parks more appealing to visitors and the mountain biking community has a great advocate with the International Mountain Biking Association (IMBA) to ensure it's done correctly.

Please consider this and thank you for your time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2549    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:00:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No Action Plan.

Leave the locals alone!

City people should have so much control over our culture and heritage. We don't bother them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2550    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:01:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support opening the trails of the Ozark Scenic Waterways Area to mountain bikers.

Thanks!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2551    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:02:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

Allowing mountain biking and/or bicycling in general in these areas is important to me as a potential visitor to the area, to area tourism, enjoy the scenery, and just get away from it all for a few days.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2552    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:07:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I go to a lot of places to ride and always end up spending money near the destination.

Going to trails without a bike isn't an option, those places never get on my list of places to visit.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2553    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:09:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I encourage the opening of the trails of the Ozark Scenic Waterways Area to mountain bikers.

THANK YOU!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2554    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:12:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would consider myself an occasional visitor to the park (3-4 visits per year). I canoe every visit, and gravel bar camp most visits. The bluffs, trees, and wildlife are definitely quality attributes of the park, but in my opinion, the quality of the water is the number one aspect to be concerned about.

To me, it seems as if Alternative A would go the farthest in maintaining and improving the quality of the river water. As I stated above, my primary use of the park is canoeing, so I favor that kind of activity, but I accept that it is a public park and all users should have access. However, the noise, fumes, oil, waves, and sediment churning caused by the motor boats does significantly affect conditions in the park, and of the water quality. Alternative A, does not prohibit motor boats on the river, just moves them downstream where the river is wider and we can avoid their wake and fumes (but not noise).

With that said though, maintaining the quality of the water in the rivers is the responsibility of all users of the park. Non-motorized users of the rivers also need to take responsibility for the water. Users should be educated, aware, and accountable for their actions that degrade the quality of the water.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2555    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cave Research Foundation  
February 7, 2014

Bill Black

Superintendent

Ozark National Scenic Riverways

Van Buren MO 63965

Re: Draft General Management Plan

Dear Superintendent Black:

This constitutes the response of the Cave Research Foundation (CRF) to the proposed Ozark Riverways Draft General Management Plan.

CRF believes that usage patterns that have developed over the last thirty years have had a degrading impact on the natural resources of the park. Specifically:

- Excessive canoe usage on certain stretches has caused problems of bank erosion, trash, and vandalism.
- Excessive power boat usage has caused erosion issues, negative effects on the habitat of the Ozark hellbender, high noise levels, water quality issues, and a general degradation of the visitor experience.
- A poor trail system limits alternative forms of non-motorized recreation.
- Unrestricted horse usage has had many negative impacts on soils, erosion, visitor experience, and water quality.
- The tremendous growth of off-road vehicular use has also negatively affected many of the values of the park. In our experience, for example, the Jam-Up Cave area (a designated natural area) has been greatly affected. Rough trails which were rarely used in, say, 1980 have become roads and, to a certain extent, institutionalized.
- Increased numbers of maintained roads has not resulted in higher levels of visitor enjoyment. Traditional family usage has dropped during the years we have been involved with the park.
- Scenic easements have been widely violated without enforcement.
- Traditional usage of the rivers, the intent of the park enabling legislation, has been replaced by too much high-volume and disruptive usage patterns.

Wilderness

We favor wilderness designation for the Big Spring primitive area. The present usage patterns would not change much but designation would provide an accessible wilderness for families in a safe environment. Such a designation, along with attendant trailheads, would stimulate visitation to the area and provide an economic stimulus to the area.

Alternatives to General Management

The no-action "alternative" should not be considered because, basically, it would continue practices that are currently illegal and against NPS policy. This would result in degraded visitor experience which eventually would have a severe impact on the economic base of the surrounding communities.

We favor Alternative B with some important modifications.

-Because high usage and large numbers of access points have caused considerable problems, we do not support keeping the present number of access points. We favor reducing these to a manageable level. Many of these access points were not usable thirty years ago, and a return to that status is needed. For example, on the upper Jacks Fork, concession-available access points are only needed at a very few sites: Buck Hollow, Bay Creek, and Alley Spring.

-We support the creation of new concession opportunities for non-motorized activities. The potential exists for shuttle service for backpackers as trails continue to be built in the river corridor.

-Horse trails should be limited to old road beds where degradation can be minimized. However, a joint backpacking and horse trail should be considered utilizing old roads on the upper Current River. Such a trail could go from Round Spring all the way to Cedargrove.

-We do not support the creation of new horse camps unless they are remote camps, utilized for overnight trips, or unless they replace current, unauthorized, unmaintained social camps. Otherwise off-park facilities would be beneficial to the local community. Horse camps are not a low-maintenance item and a proliferation of them will likely degrade natural resources.

-We support the creation of a learning center at Powder Mill, provided that does not reduce the usage of the present research center, which is not mentioned. CRF occasionally keeps the present center open as a visitor contact point, with good results. The research center has enabled thousands of hours to be volunteered in the interest of park natural resource management. The wording of the GMP alternative says that "some living quarters" "might" be provided. This should be reworded if the intent is to keep the research center element. If the intent would be to remove the research center, then we would certainly be in opposition to that.

-Wording should be added that addresses partnering with "volunteers and others" to accomplish natural resource stewardship projects; that language was used for "cultural" resource projects but no mention was made of natural resource partnerships, which are ongoing at this time. The ongoing partnership with CRF and others has provided for effective management of cave resources within the park. Not mentioning this type of natural resource partnership is an oversight, one that could potentially be interpreted as unauthorized.

-We do not favor the horsepower limits as delineated in Alternative B. Specifically, we believe that horsepower limits be lowered on the Current River between Pulltite and Two Rivers. We suggest 25 horsepower limits between Two Rivers and Round Spring, and no motors allowed at all above Round Spring. If high-horsepower usage is reduced on these stretches then canoe traffic can be redistributed to these sections, as was the case in the 1970's. Family camping on the stretch of river between Round Spring and Two Rivers has just about vanished due to the high usage by powerboats, day and night.

-Depending on the spread and disposition of White Nose Syndrome, CRF supports the opening of such caves as can handle traffic. However, visitation of caves should never be considered to be of high recreational value. Most OZAR caves are either: too small to be of recreational interest, too geologically or biologically sensitive, or are technical in nature requiring specialized equipment or skills.

-Under Alternative B it is said that no FTE increase in Resource Management and Science will be needed despite additional responsibilities and duties. We cannot agree with this statement. For example, Ozark Riverways has the largest karst springs of any national park unit, and yet there is no physical science or hydrologist or geologist position. This should be changed in the final plan and a goal made to create a physical science position through the addition of one FTE in natural resources.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Shawn E. Williams  
Ozarks Operation Joint Venturer  
Cave Research Foundation  
Member  
Missouri Caves and Karst Conservancy  
2916 Osage St.  
St. Louis, MO 63118

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2556    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:13:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for reading my comment and hope that mtb will be accepted on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Having the opportunity to mountain bike in this area would be unlike anything in St. Louis or St.

Charles as it truly feels like an adventure when I am able to ride at the Berryman, Middlefork, etc. and love showing new riders AND hikers this vast land we have.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2557    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:14:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm writing to share my comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan (GMP).

I prefer Alternative B as outlined in the Draft General Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement. As a National Scenic Riverway and the largest national park in Missouri I would love to see the integrity of the Ozark Riverway preserved beyond my lifetime and the lifetime of my children. I specifically value the riverway for its recreational boating and for the exploration of natural beauty through hiking and education. Preservation and restoration enables the remote natural beauty of this riverway to exist far into the future. I have specifically made use of the Ozark Riverway through hiking and floating on both the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. As a frequent visitor to national and state parks, especially those in more remote areas, I understand maintaining the balance of recreation and preservation is a difficult task. I think both can be done and the Ozark Riverways GMP can pave the way for an example of how other national parks can hold this balance. Although our modern tendency is to develop & commercialize beautiful areas such as the Ozark Riverways, that tendency leads to overuse, whether intentional or unintentionally. This riverway, like any of our national parks, is too beautiful, too rare, too important to the habitat of many rare species of birds, fish, plants, and amphibians, to be ruined by overuse or careless use that unintentionally leads to the slow demise of the area. The pristine springs and caves that millions have come to love through visiting this area will be ruined if the National Park Service does not continue to manage this riverway. I appreciate the conservation and preservation functions of the National Park because it ensures that a consistent plan of preservation, restoration, education, and prudent recreational use will be carried out. I can appreciate the desire of many, especially those who live closest to the Ozark Riverways, to have as much access to the riverways as they would like. And it is also no small factor that the Ozark Riverways is an economical asset to this area of Missouri. To me this is exactly why I support Alternative B because the National Park Service will be able to continue to support the economical and local needs that come from this great riverway while at the same time preserving it for those who benefit from it beyond Missouri and beyond this generation or the next. The 'No Action' alternative is unacceptable to me because it fails to address the need for more enforcement of existing laws and standards, to better manage overcrowding, and to improve communication and partnership with local landowners and communities. Further, it fails to address the critical problems in the Riverways such as eroded tracks in riparian areas and on gravel bars from motorized vehicles, explosive growth of equestrian use and proliferation of undesignated trails and river crossings (many of which are in sensitive riverine areas or on steep, heavily-eroded slopes); overcrowding in certain reaches of the rivers and resulting conflicts among user groups, and inadequate monitoring and enforcement of scenic easements. I have personally seen some these areas that have been effected by erosion from human use, especially motorized vehicle use. This riverway will not be able to be enjoyed by all with the unmonitored use of motorized vehicles and horses. These uses of the riverways are simply too harsh on the local ecology to go unrestricted, and unmonitored. The Alternative Plan B will address these issues and ensure the Ozark Riverway can be enjoyed by all, both local and national, and for years to come.

Sincerely,  
Troy Woytek & Emma Harty

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2558    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:15:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Suggested comment:

I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make

the park more appealing to visitors.

Many areas of the country are recognizing the positive economic impact that mountain biking can bring to an area. Mountain bikers need gas, food, drinks, lodging, etc. These purchases can bring a tremendous economic boom to an area and should not be discounted.

Doug Smith

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2559    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:15:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern:

For 65 years I have visited the lands that are now in and adjoining the park; I nearly flunked out of MU because I spent so much time writing letters and persuading people to support the establishment of the park. So I have some serious skin in its preservation.

I commend the NPS for making the effort to update the management plan. In general I support Proposal B, with more beefing up on protection of riparian areas, removal of nonnative vegetation, and managing the area next to Big Spring to preserve its wilderness qualities. Staffing and enforcement are critical concerns and the NPS has got to drop the attitude that it can please all the high-impact recreationists and the Congressional delegation by letting the Park resources be consumed, not protected for today and tomorrow.

In particular, no horse campground should be set aside in the park. Private lands and concessionaires can supply that need and add to the economic benefits the park brings to local economies. Motorboats need to be confined to certain areas and motorized access limited. Lately when I've gone to the park some areas were being "loved" to death by too many people, machines, and horses. Adding more quiet hiking areas would be low impact and welcome.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn Johnson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2560    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:17:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please leave regulations on the National Scenic River ways as they are currently. I believe there are adequate regulations as it stands. Please do not take more access away from the people who currently use the rivers for recreation. Enforce current regulations on littering and defacing the areas and allow those of us who take care of it to continue using it as we have for years

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2561    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:17:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support opening the trails of the Ozark Scenic Waterways Area to mountain bikers. It would be great. Thanks!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2562    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:20:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

I have a family of 4 and we are all avid mountain bikers. I would love to see the opportunity for us to utilize our Scenic Riverways on our bikes. We do not visit currently as biking is such a huge part of our lives.

I hope you consider Alternative B as it is really a fair and balance option for all.

Respectfully  
Bob Arnold

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2563    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:25:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I do not agree with Congressman Jason Smith and his amendment to lock in place current motor vessel rules and regulations. I concur with most of the "Preferred" alternative B draft plan as is.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2564    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:30:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Plan B as the best compromise to allow for access while mitigating damage from overuse. Please consider amending offseason power boat regulations on the rivers where applicable to allow for fishing as it has been practiced for some time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2565    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:30:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** After reviewing the proposed alternatives I feel that alternative C "No Action" is the best course of action for the ONSR. This gives the opportunity for citizens to enjoy the park in a variety of different ways. Also, as a frequent visitor of the park for the past 7 years and based on the environmental impact studies, I do not believe there is an ecological reason to further restrict access to the ONSR. We enjoy camping at Current River and hope to raise our children continuing to boat ride and have fun on a beautiful river as we have in the past. We always respect the rules and guidelines set forth by the park services and hope access to the river will not change.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2566    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:37:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2567    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:37:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I favor alternative B with the following modifications.

reduce the present number of access points to those available 30 years ago.

Horse trails should be limited to old road beds.

Horse power limits should be lowered and no motors allowed above Round Springs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2568    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:39:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** That Would be a wonderful idea. It would not only encourage people to spend time outdoors, but it would be a perfect alternative vacation destination. I would love to take my three boys and wife on a bike trail like that.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2569    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:49:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2570    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:49:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2571    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:50:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in all favor of opening the trails up for bike usage. Such a beautiful area that would be perfect for exploring by bike. As with most bike accessible trails, you will likely gain a large volunteer base as well to help with the maintenance of the trail.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2572    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:53:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a person that loves being outdoors and experiencing our wonderful natural resources I support both Alternative B and C with B as my preference. I oppose the no-action alternative.

I believe mountain biking should be allowed on trails, as well as horseback riding and hiking.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2573    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:57:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Allowing mountain biking on certain trails will increase the number of park visitors. Mountain bikes have a land impact equal or less than that of hikers and horseback riders and virtually zero water quality impact. At minimum, the Ozark Trail should be reassigned as multi-use in order to create a critical link for riders and hikers alike so that they may traverse the entire natural trail without detour.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2574    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 11:01:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I was born and raised within a mile of the current river (log yard powder mill area) In my 40 years here I've seen many changes in regulations and usage. I support the NO CHANGE OPTION because we

already have more than enough regulations. We have very little patrol from the NPS. There are occasionally issues that arise, but they would be less if there was a presence of law enforcement. As for the question of motor size, give us a speedlimit. A boat rigged for fishing (extra weight) can hardly run on plane with a 60/40 if you put a family (4) in the boat, as the jet pump is very sensitive to weight. I hunt and fish the current river alot in the off-season. In the winter I use some of the (so called over used areas) you can't distinguish them from any other area when the people are not present. If you can't tell a difference in the winter,there obviously is no harm being done in the summer. The river access points need to be altered as the river changes. Cavdiriva landing has been eroded away over the years to the point you can hardly launch a boat. While a half a mile away LogYard has a great spot and access road to it, yet the NPS won,t call it a access point. Actually they are wanting to close it permently. I am not a business owner, but I understand the impact that the boats have on this community. Ellington is where I call home, unlike Salem,Eminence, and Van Buren we do not have canoe rentals or any other consessions. Ellington relies on boat sales,fuel sales, snacks and money spent by people that enjoy the river by boat.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2575    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 11:03:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The ONSR is Missouri's jewel, the only NPS park. This unique area is a national treasure, just like Yellowstone, Rocky Mountains, and other NPs. While local residents may want unrestricted access, the long term impact of countless ATV traffic, jeep trails and excessive boat ramps will degrade the area. Take the long view. I want my great grandkids to be able to enjoy what I do.

I appreciate and enjoy the parks immensely. Our family visits the parks on a yearly basis. Thank you for this opportunity.  
dan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2576    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 11:04:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Make no changes! Leave the existing rules in place. We are totally opposed to government control over our waterways. America is a country of freedom, not one restricting citizens from using our natural resources for recreation!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2577    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 11:05:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family and I request you to give increased consideration for mountain biking in the current and future General Management Plans. My family and I oppose the no-action option which continues the prohibition to mountain biking. We urge you to allow mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in this and future plans.

Well-designed mountain bike trails are sustainable and do not have adverse environmental impacts when properly constructed in the right locations. In fact, their environmental impact is often far lower than other trail options- -for instance, equestrian trails.

I feel that the current situation, with mountain biking disallowed on all existing trails and bicycling on area roads discouraged by the Scenic Riverways web page, does not allow visitors the full range of recreation options that are normally available at similar state and national parks across the nation.

Missouri and its surrounding states have a large and active mountain biking population that will very much use and appreciate these trails and access to this beautiful area.

I encourage you to involve bicycling and mountain biking groups when making decisions about trail access in the Scenic Riverways area.

Thank You,

---



**Correspondence ID:** 2578    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 11:06:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of the National Park Service adopting Alternative B as its plan for managing the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, the Jacks Fork and Current rivers. I do not live in the affected area but am a monthly visitor to Reynolds County and have developed such an appreciation for the unique treasure the Ozark rivers and springs are for Missouri. Visiting these areas of natural wonder makes me feel proud of all that Missouri has to offer that many other states do not have available to them. But like all the special natural wonders, on a local, state, and national level, these assets are too vulnerable not to be protected. How often, at all levels, has the battle for preservation been required in order to maintain what is most worthy to save. Too many people think Nature is their's to enjoy or profit from in any way they choose and see regulation as challenge to their personal freedom rather than a tool for protecting what they want to enjoy and profit from. Keeping what is best about the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, for now and for future generations, ensures its value for all. Thank you for providing a means for people to give input.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2579    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 11:10:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Because I frequently visit the Ozark Riverways to enjoy the peace, quiet and recreational opportunities that it affords, I would suggest that Alternative A be adopted. In my opinion, there are too many motorized vehicles such as powerboats and ATVs that not only destroy the land, but destroy the ambience that this wilderness area should provide.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2580    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 11:12:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**  
I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2581    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 11:13:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**  
February 3, 2014

Mr. Bill Black, Superintendent  
Ozark National Scenic Riverways  
404 Watercress Drive  
P.O. Box 490  
Van Buren, MO 63965  
VIA U.S. Mail and Online at NPS.GOV

RE: Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan/Wilderness Study/EIS

Dear Superintendent Black:

On behalf of the Missouri Coalition for the Environment (the Coalition), we submit these comments in response to Ozark National Scenic Riverways' Draft General Management Plan/Wilderness Study, dated October 2013.

The National Park Services (NPS) submitted a Draft General Management Plan (DGMP) for Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) dated October 2013. The DGMP contains three "action alternatives" to address park management issues since the ONSR's last comprehensive planning effort completed in 1984. The DGMP also contains a "No Action" alternative that would leave the NPS' management of ONSR as is and would leave many management issues unaddressed. At the NPS' various hearings on the proposed DGMP, and in the popular press, a number of people and entities have suggested that the NPS simply take no action and continue to operate under the earlier management plan. Taking no action deviates from the NPS' statutory and regulatory directives and is not in accordance with the NPS' own guidance. A new General Management Plan (GMP) is needed and the NPS should move forward with its plans to issue one.

Federal law requires the NPS to file a GMP in a "timely manner" to address changes and provide guidelines for future management of ONSR. See 16 U.S.C. Â§ 1a-7(b). Because the NPS' 1984 planning and management effort for ONSR is outdated, a new GMP must be developed in order to comply with the statutory mandate.

According to section 1a-7(b), a GMP provides guidelines for park management and development- including desired resource conditions, user capacity standards, visitor use management, and changes to boundary modifications- and has an expected life of fifteen to twenty years. ONSR's last management effort was conducted over 29 years ago. ONSR's natural conditions and the park's usage have significantly transformed since the 1984 planning effort. Visitor intensity changes, increased recreational activity, new illegal access points, uses of neighboring property changes, and unresolved legal compliance issues require new management directives that should be addressed by issuance of a new GMP. A new GMP is required to address the current conditions and to provide guidelines for future management of ONSR.

Since the early 1980s, the park has experienced a significant increase in the number of visitors. This requires NPS to revisit the methods by which it achieves its purposes: conservation and interpretation of the unique scenic values as well as the provisions for use and enjoyment of these resources. See 16 U.S.C. Â§ 460-m. Increased visitor traffic means more stress on the park. These changes must be addressed through a new GMP.

In addition to the increased number of visitors, the ONSR has faced a significant increase in certain types of recreational activity. Since the early 1980s, ATV usage and river activity such as canoeing, floating, tubing, boating, rafting fishing and horseback riding have increased. These recreational activities have brought an increased use of illegal park and river access points, along with overcrowding from an increase in the number and size of motorboats used on its waters. It is the NPS' task to account for these changes in recreational patterns and balance them against the need to conserve the environment. Management cannot rely on an old, outdated planning effort, which was developed before these significant changes, and still accomplish this balancing act. The NPS must take action and adopt a new general management plan as its October 2013 draft envisions.

Moreover, the ONSR has seen an increase in motorboat usage with retrofitted motors in excess of forty horsepower. See 56 FR 30694, July 5, 1991. The regulations to which the ONSR is currently subject do not allow motorboats with more than forty horsepower. See 36 CFR Â§ 7.83(a)(2). The Department of Interior Regional Solicitor's Office has advised the NPS regarding this issue and has determined that retrofitted 60/40 motorboats violate the federal regulation. Despite this known violation, the NPS continues to allow 60/40 motorboat usage on ONSR's waters. A new GMP is needed to address these issues. Continuing management under the "No Action" plan- essentially keeping the earlier management guidelines in place- would continue to violate existing regulations. Id. The NPS must either enforce the regulation or make changes to the regulation to accommodate the use of 60/40 horsepower motorboats through an updated management plan.

Thank you for the opportunity to present these comments. If you have any questions about the above or if you would like to discuss the Coalition's comments, please let me know. My contact information is below.

Sincerely,

Tony Guan  
Student Attorney, Certified under Rule 13  
Elizabeth J. Hubertz

Clinic Attorney  
Interdisciplinary Environmental Clinic  
Washington University School of Law  
One Brookings Drive  
Campus Box 1120  
St. Louis, MO 63130

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2582    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 11:14:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe mountain biking should be allowed on trails in the Ozarks. Mountain biking is a sustainable activity with a large user base and a large volunteer base that has shown in other areas around the nation and in Missouri that multiuse trails are successful and attracts more users to view the natural beauty that Missouri has to offer.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2583    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 11:16:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a representative radio show host that has an audience of thousands of local folks within the ONSR area, I can provide feedback of the communications, calls, emails and contact I receive regarding this project and the proposed changes.

My listeners are adamant about their position on this issue. First, we would like the NPS to return the land to the State of Missouri.

Second, since you will not willingly relinquish that which you have taken, we seek the NPS to leave the existing rules in place that are current and MAKE NO ADDITIONAL CHANGES.

What you are proposing will cause immeasurable harm to the economy of our region from a number of perspectives. The limits on access will reduce visitation from both locals and outside visitors, the limits on horseback trails and 'unauthorized' river crossings will harm the horseback business(es) in the area and they bring in far greater revenue to the GDP of the region than almost any other visitor traffic.

In short, Leave the existing rules alone and make no changes.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2584    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 11:17:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for seeing feedback on this plan. Firstly, I would like to oppose the "No-Action" option. Furthermore, I support the NPS Preferred option - Alternative B.

Any option that opens trails and encourages more mountain biking opportunities would receive my support. Missouri and neighboring states have many people who could more fully enjoy the recreation provided by Ozark National Scenic Riverways area if mountain biking were an available activity. Since mountain biking is a low impact activity and, often, people who ride mountain bikes help to maintain the trails, this could be a win-win opportunity.

Please continue to seek feedback on additional Nation Park operations and I also encourage park officials to involve bicycling and mountain biking groups when making decisions on allowed park recreational activities.

Thanks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2585    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 11:20:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am very concerned with the impact of usage on public parks, whether regional, state or

national. But I also want to make such areas accessible to as many users as is feasible, safe and responsible. That said, I support allowing mountain biking on designated trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I feel it is a way to interact in a meaningful way with the natural area. It can be one of several ways to encourage our national populace to value the natural world. And through park fees (and associated spending in area businesses) it can help to fund the upkeep of these natural areas.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways. Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. River floating can have a negative impact through litter, etc. To make legislation based on the sins of a small minority of users is irresponsible and unfair.

Making an area multi-use in a responsible manner is the best plan. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2586    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 11:24:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support A

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2587    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 11:26:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As an avid bicycle rider and mountain biking enthusiast, I fully support opening the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to mountain biking. The access granted to mountain bikes on the Ozark Trail has always been appreciated and has personally afforded me some wonderful experiences. I can only hope for more of the same in the Riverways. My only concern therein is with the 'Primitive' designation. If mountain bikes are to be excluded from from primitive sections, why then allow the horses. Unquestionably, a bicycle tire is far lower impact than horse hooves and cyclists do not often evacuate their bowels on the trail.

Thank you for your consideration,

David Dye

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2588    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors. It helps generate revenue for the state with races and events being held in the parks. I am a race promoter, and I fight to use MY parks. I have dealt with the MO DNR the past 16 months to come up with an agreement on park use/fee structure for the state of Missouri that is now in place. Mountain biking should be allowed as well as mountain bike related events. All those around these events can benefit from the trails we build/maintain and the revenue we generate attending these events.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2589    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
Ozark National Scenic Riverways  
404 Watercress Dr.  
P.O. Box 490  
Van Buren, MO 63965

RE: Comments of the Missouri Coalition for the Environment on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan (GMP)

Dear Superintendent:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways ('Riverways'), established by PL #88-492 on August 17, 1964, called for protecting the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers (originally, the Eleven Point was also included). The Riverways showcase several world-class freshwater springs, caves, and bluffs that are home to fish, birds, rare and endangered native amphibians, crawfish, and plants.

The Current and Jacks Fork Rivers are prime recreational waters in a stunning natural karst area that attracts approximately 1.5 million visitors each year. A 2011 study estimated visitor spending at more than \$55 million with nearly 90 percent of spending from non-local visitors. Local businesses that cater to visitors include outfitters (fishing, canoe rental, inner tube rental, kayak rental and horse trail riding), lodging providers, and restaurants. Because of visitor spending and employment by the National Park Service, the Riverways has generated 845 jobs, which is approximately 15 percent of the total employment in Shannon and Carter counties. In addition, the local population enjoys a river-centric culture that includes gigging, fishing, boating, camping, canoeing, and trail riding. Accordingly, maintaining water quality is important for the local economy and culture that depend on these waterways for recreational uses.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways' enabling act has three stated purposes: preservation, conservation, and recreation. As a unit of the National Park System (NPS), management of the Riverways must ensure protection of the Park's resources in an unimpaired condition for public recreation, education, and scientific value. The Missouri Coalition for the Environment, a state-based environmental and conservation organization, urges the NPS to adopt, in general, Alternative B, with some modifications from Alternative A, and a minimally restrictive policy on boating.

The National Park Service prefers Alternative 'B', among the approaches offered to managing the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. In general, we support Alternative B as well, with a few key modifications that provide an approach that balances recreation with conservation and preservation so that the Riverways can be enjoyed by people today and generations to come.

The three purposes of the Riverways which support a healthy national park - conservation, preservation, and recreation - are interdependent components. The park attracts people because of the quality of the resource. People have come to love and rely on the quality of the water, the fishing, the camping, the wildlife, the education, the history, and the scenery.

We know that ignoring standards and regulations does not protect waters. In places where people, local and state governments have done as they pleased to their local spring-fed, Ozark streams, the streams are filled with pollutants, scummy algae, and disease-causing bacteria. The variety of native fish has vanished leaving worms and leeches surviving amid sewage and trash. Typically these streams are contaminated with bacteria and sediment and, in urban areas, with chloride. Saint Louis County once had its own spring-fed streams and locals remember fishing for smallmouth bass in their clear waters. In rural areas across the state Missourians lament the loss of their traditional 'swimming holes' at the creek where they cooled down in hot summers and where congregations baptized their congregants. And today so many will not go near the now-degraded lakes, creeks, and streams they once frequented.

Some Missouri waters are not even fit for watering livestock because of contamination. A laissez-faire management policy has destroyed the quality of many of Missouri's waters which, in urban areas, were rendered little more than storm sewers. It was not one decision that destroyed these waters. It was thousands of them - death by a thousand cuts. They are now sources of extreme erosion, flash flooding, and pollution. They cost public and private entities millions as they flood and undercut public works. Restoring their health is an expensive process that will require decades, though, in urban areas, they will never achieve their original quality. Prevention of damage is much less costly and more effective. We urge the NPS to remember these lessons as it moves forward.

Clearly, allowing people free rein over streams leads to degradation of the resource. Recognition of this reality has

prompted people who love the land to seek preservation and conservation of our natural resources through designating certain areas to be handled with exceptional care and extraordinary consideration. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is one of those places, like Yellowstone, the Grand Canyon, the Buffalo National River, and Bryce Canyon.

#### A New General Management Plan Is Needed

Action is desperately needed to address the following key issues:

1. Unauthorized roads that allow vehicles to impact sensitive riparian zones or even the river itself. Studies have revealed that dirt and gravel roads within the Ozarks in general are the largest source of sediments to streams, outweighing the combined impacts of pasture erosion, logging, and natural erosion. Researchers found that heavily used gravel roads can contribute 100 times more sediment than paved or abandoned roads. Roads can cause marginally stable slopes to fail, and they can capture surface runoff and channel it directly into streams resulting in increased sediment deposition. The 1991 NPS study of roads and trails found that the existing system of roads results in "substantial sediment loading to small creeks that empty into the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers," which reduces water quality and adversely impacts riparian vegetation.

Over 130 motorized vehicular river-access points exist on the Riverways, according to a 2007 Friends of the Ozark Riverways' analysis. Virtually all gravel bars (used for canoe and boat camping) are accessed by all-terrain vehicles (ATVs) and other motorized vehicles (American Rivers 2011). ORV (Off-Road Vehicle) activity also increases erosion and sedimentation by exposing bare erodible soils in areas with frequent activity.

2. Unauthorized horse trails in riparian zones or sensitive areas prone to erosion and degradation. Studies conducted by the USGS, NPS and the Missouri Department of Natural Resources have suggested that "heavy recreation use is causing adverse impacts on the water quality of the Jacks Fork River, including elevated fecal coliform bacteria densities that exceed the standard for whole body contact recreation." Indeed, in May 2011, the Riverways were identified as one of America's ten most endangered rivers due to inadequate management by the NPS (American Rivers 2011). Horseback riding near or in the Riverways can also increase sedimentation and nutrient loads and reduce available dissolved oxygen.

3. Overcrowding at certain access points during peak times. Better accommodating crowds at some locations and redistributing load points across the Riverways as proposed in the Alternatives can help ensure access to the Rivers while minimizing damage.

4. Discourteous, irresponsible, rowdy, or drunken behavior that endangers public safety, fuels conflict, and risks damage to the resource.

5. The importance of the Riverways as habitat for the Ozark Hellbender and other sensitive species.

6. Vehicles on gravel bars. Vehicles can contribute to increased erosion in riparian zones. Where evidence demonstrates a negative impact from gravel bar travel, vehicle access should be minimized or even eliminated and accommodated elsewhere. In addition, floaters camping on gravel bars should not need to worry about being run over by vehicles plowing through camp sites. Limiting vehicle access to designated gravel bars will increase public safety for boaters and floaters who will still access gravel bars by water. Vehicle drivers can take comfort that they will not be in danger of running over campers if the areas are clearly designated. However, if data show adverse impact to the Riverways from gravel bar camping (like trash left behind, human waste impacts) then gravel bar camping may need additional restrictions.

The Riverways need a strong management plan. We recommend a Management Plan that:

1. Explores NPS participation in watershed scale activities because the Riverways' health is impacted by actions throughout its catchment area that feed surface and subsurface water (and their contaminants) to the Rivers. State and federal partners for this watershed level work include the Missouri Dept. of Conservation, the Dept. of Natural Resources, and USDA.

2. Keeps the horse camp out of the Riverways and, instead, encourages such development on adjacent private land so that the opportunities a horse camp provides accrue to the private sector. The NPS does not need to be in the horse camp business and compete with those who are. Equestrian overuse is a significant threat to water quality and the Ozark Hellbender. As such, we are pleased that all action alternatives will establish a permitting system, as necessary, to manage impacts of horse use. Unlike Alternative B and Alternative C, Alternative A would not allow horse camping. We are opposed to a developed horse campground along the Jacks Fork. We instead encourage private landowners outside the Jacks Fork watershed to pursue a horse camp outside the Riverways, where the impacts would be minimized and yet trail riders would have access to enjoy the beauty of the Rivers. In any case, any horse campground would attract additional use of the horse trail system, which is already strained from overuse. Solutions involving private landowners and land outside the Riverways must be found. Nevertheless, making such a project a business as well as a Park success story will require much collaboration, planning and partnership. In any case, the horse camp need not be in the Riverways to be a benefit to all.

3. Expands environmental education to all users. For example, educating visitors with boats that they should be maintained in good condition to prevent gasoline from getting into the water. Boaters should know the benefits of engine maintenance and be aware of where they can obtain engine care. Local dealers and service providers may be able to help educate their clients on key issues like this. Education can also help the Hellbender. Some of the impacts to Ozark Hellbenders are the result of unintentional but harmful human activities that could be modified with public education. For example, some canoeists move boulders to avoid collisions without realizing that they are destroying potential hellbender habitat. And some anglers kill hellbenders based on myths that they are poisonous and damage the sport fishery. We recommend that the NPS promote public education about the importance of hellbenders with various forms of outreach, such as signs and displays.

4. Expands outdoor skills development & fitness. Forty years ago, a need was identified to help visitors to the Riverways learn the skills to enjoy it, navigate it, and care for it. When Dennis Drabelle (then Special Assistant to the Asst. Secretary for Fish & Wildlife & Parks with the Dept. of Interior) wrote in 1976, "I would like to see the Park Service help people learn to canoe on the river, rather than slam from log to rock all the way down," he described a situation that is little improved today. From canoeing skills, to hiking, equestrian, camping, orienteering, swimming, survival, and foraging, the need for these skills is even greater today as youth are more and more disconnected from the outdoors. The NPS should expand its partnerships to help foster local businesses, state agencies, and NGO's that can provide these services while employing local residents who already know the land and love the Rivers. Canoeing and kayaking are also more active fitness options than "tubing" down the river and learning these skills can impact a person's individual fitness as well as safety on the Rivers.

The partnerships in the Riverways should include institutions of higher learning to apply STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) education and job training to the Riverways as a living laboratory, as well as a broader understanding of ecosystems, history, art, and culture. The NPS should develop a complete curriculum that ensures that its staff knows the Riverways- and that showcases local history, community engagement, and highlights visitor education. An NGO dedicated to the Riverways could fill part of this gap with on-line resources, community partnerships, and funding assistance.

5. Develops broader and more effective partnerships and systems to foster dialogue among park users, park neighbors and park staff to work cooperatively to identify, evaluate, and solve problems.

6. Restores the NPS commitment to preserving cultural features of the Riverways, including expanding curatorial capacity, artifact restoration, education activities, and repair and maintenance of historical buildings. Strengthening partnerships with local individuals and organizations to preserve cemeteries and historic sites, and to engage visitors in educational activities should be a key component of the new General Management Plan. Such activities help reinforce the sense of place of the Riverways in the context of the Ozarks which is the home of the people whose sacrifices and commitment have helped preserve the Riverways. The long-term health of the watershed depends upon them.

7. Adopts the approach in Alternative A for roads and trails. Because undesignated roads and trails can contribute to water quality degradation through erosion and sedimentation, we support the NPS's proposals to close undesignated and illegal routes. Alternative A would restore 50 miles of such routes and Alternative B would restore 45 miles. In addition, Alternative A would replace 15 miles of undesignated roads with hiking trails and Alternative B would

replace 10 miles. Although both of these alternatives are a big improvement over the existing condition, Alternative A is more aggressive at addressing illegal and undesignated routes and should be adopted if the NPS has sufficient funding and other resources to make these needed improvements. If the resources are unavailable for restoring these roads, the commitment must be made to enforcement.

8. Restores the riparian corridor. To reduce erosion and sedimentation, the NPS should emphasize restoring and stabilizing the riparian corridor. There should be no new conversions of bottomland riparian forests to open fields, and impaired and eroded riverbanks should be restored with native vegetation.

9. Funds the plan. We are very concerned that the NPS lacks the funding and personnel to implement the expanded recreational use and new developments that are proposed under Alternatives B and C. The Riverways has seen a 30 percent reduction in staff in the last decade due to funding decreases, and NPS should hesitate to make changes to park management that would require increases in staff to monitor resources and provide enforcement to respond to increases in use. With common complaints about the need for existing management to better enforce existing standards and regulations, resources should be targeted to this need above new activities.

10. Expands waste management. With 1.5 million visitors, the need for expanded, manageable and sustainable sewage treatment and restroom facilities is critical. Responsible waste management needs to be a priority in the GMP, with careful attention to users, the environment and operating budgets. Modern composting toilets, improved siting and signage, and user education are likely part of the solution.

We recognize that there has been a lot of attention on the use and limitations of boats on the Riverways. Decisions about limitations, including speed limits or horsepower limits, should be driven by data that documents actual benefits to be gained from prohibitions. Local residents that enjoy their boats on the river year round should still be able to use the river year round. Motorized boats play an important role in rescuing floaters, as well as keeping local residents in touch with river conditions. We recommend a thorough study of the impact of motorized vehicles in the Riverways, especially the impacts on habitat for species such as the Ozark Hellbender and species of concern. In the interim, if excessive use or irresponsible behavior endangers the resource or public safety, then NPS can act as needed through enforcement.

Further, it is laudable to attempt to manage the Riverways in order to achieve an experience of solitude and contemplation on the Rivers on a Saturday in July, however, it is perhaps misguided. Weekends in the summer are going to draw thousands to the clear, cold water of the Riverways and the crowds are a by-product of appeal. If solitude is sought, people can adjust the time of their float or the day and achieve it without a wholesale NPS policy change. Floaters beginning their trip in the late afternoon will likely enjoy a less crowded river than those leaving at 10 a.m. on a weekend. Those visiting the Rivers on a weekday are more likely to enjoy solitude. And solitude is almost assured for those visiting the Riverways in the fall, winter, or spring.

It is heartening to see that the Alternatives each propose new NPS management facilities which helps reaffirm NPS's commitment to the Riverways. Further, it is good to hear that Big Springs Lodge and Cabins, all Civilian Conservation Corps era buildings, are going to get much needed maintenance and upgrading. The Lodge facility is in desperate need of maintenance, especially the restrooms which last summer seemed to be impacted by mold.

#### Concern and consideration for the Ozark Hellbender

We have particular concerns about the Ozark Hellbender, the largest salamander in North America. It is primarily affected by water quality, including sedimentation and nutrient loads. Increased siltation may affect hellbenders in a variety of ways, such as suffocating eggs, eliminating suitable habitat for all life stages, reducing dissolved oxygen levels, increasing contaminants (that bind to sediments), raising water temperatures, impeding movements, and reducing prey populations.

As such, any activities on the Riverways that impact water quality may in turn impact the salamander and its habitats. Ongoing activities near or on the Riverways that deposit sediment or nutrient loads in waterways include use of the road and trail system and recreational activities (such as boating, ATV use, and horseback riding). These activities in the rivers may also directly harm or disturb Ozark Hellbenders or their cover rocks. We share the concerns of the Center for Biological Diversity about the endangered Ozark Hellbender and encourage the NPS to



find ways to help educate stakeholders about the threats the Hellbender faces, as well as to protect its habitat.

We understand that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will be preparing an Endangered Species Act Section 7 biological opinion on the effects of the GMP on endangered wildlife within the OSNR, including the Ozark hellbender, Indiana bat, and gray bat. We are pleased that the NPS is consulting with the Service and recommend that the NPS adopt any mitigation measures recommended during consultation. We hope that the Riverways can support all of its native inhabitants- humans and amphibians.

#### Horse Use

With regard to horses, the capacity of the land to support the enormous demand for trail rides (for example, 3,000 horse stalls at Eminence) needs to be assessed to determine how horse use can best be accommodated. Solutions may include re-routing trails from sensitive areas, improving permitting, improving trails, better signage, better enforcement, encouraging off-park trails, route disclosure by riders with commitments to adhere to marked trails, and coordinating incentives to achieve temporal distribution of horse users at peak times (to prevent overloading on peak weekends). One researcher identified horse trails that include more than 80 places where horses cross the rivers. These areas can harm water quality with erosion and fecal coliform pollution. A 1991 NPS study suggested that the NPS consider restricting the total number of horse riders by utilizing a permit system (NPS 1991). At the time, the majority of riders in the Riverways were guided rides. This situation may have changed, which might require another solution. Alternatively, encouraging the development of horse trails outside the RIVERWAYS may help redistribute the impacts to a manageable level. In any case, the solutions must be developed in cooperation with all stakeholders who can help devise creative solutions.

#### The Need for a New GMP

A new plan is needed because again and again local citizens have made it clear their firm belief that the NPS should exercise more enforcement of existing rules and standards to curb abusive, disruptive, and dangerous behavior from the handful of 'bad actors' that foment conflict and damage. They believe that if enforcement were swift, decisive, and even-handed, the 'bad actors' would be discouraged, behavior would improve, and conflicts on the Riverways would be reduced. Most agree that discourteous, drunken, rowdy, or damaging behavior should be discouraged and punished in the Riverways. We agree. All alternatives proposed except the "No Action" one in the Draft General Management Plan would increase enforcement and compliance activities of the NPS.

At the same time enforcement has lagged on existing standards, conditions have changed as uses of the park have evolved since the last plan in 1984. Today inner tubes and horse trail riding use are substantially increased, compared to the past decades when canoes were the predominant visitor use. New highways have reduced travel times from the population centers to the Riverways and have facilitated increased access by all users, which contributes to overcrowding in some areas at peak times. Overcrowding can fuel user conflicts or resource damage. Conditions have also changed in the Rivers themselves. Key aquatic species in the Riverways have declined precipitously in population, with the Ozark Hellbender salamander now making the endangered species list.

Accommodating increased use rates of activities while protecting the water quality and scenic integrity of the Riverways is a critical need. Managing waste, sewage and erosion impacts from users is important for keeping the waters clean, and may be a factor in the health of the Ozark Hellbender, an endangered species, as well. "No Action" fails to address growing issues of overcrowding in some high use areas where concentrations of users during peak times contribute to resource damage and user conflict. "No Action" is the opposite of what is needed to re-distribute access points to reduce congestion and prevent damage to the Riverways. Informed action is needed.

It is also clear that the relationship of the NPS to the residents in the region needs more routine dialogue, more joint problem solving, and more effective communication. The status quo must change. Thus, "No Action" is not an option.

For the above stated reasons, MCE recommends that NPS adopt Alternative B with noted improvements from Alternative A, which is the environmentally preferred alternative.

We support the NPS's commitment to dealing with the problems that have developed on the Riverways. If you have

any questions or would like to discuss these comments, please contact us.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Logan Smith  
Missouri Coalition for the Environment  
Director of Environmental Policy

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2590	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 11:35:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 6, 2014				

Bill Black, Superintendent  
Ozark National Scenic Riverways  
P.O. Box 490  
Van Buren, MO 63965

Dear Mr. Black:

The following are comments on behalf of the St. Louis Audubon Society regarding the alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in Missouri. The St. Louis Audubon Society has over 3,000 members in the greater St. Louis area. We are a local affiliate of the National Audubon Society whose mission is to conserve and restore natural ecosystems, primarily birds and other wildlife and their habitats, for the benefit of humanity and the earth's biological diversity.

We commend the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for its decision to review its management practices. The increased pressure of horses, mechanized vehicles, easement issues and lack of funding for enforcement is threatening the water quality and overall integrity of this superbly featured region. Many of our Missouri natural areas have been studied for bird habitat and conservation recommendations. The Riverways is within the Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA). This is one of 47 IBA's in the state, and is exceptional because it is one of the largest IBA's and overlaps with two of Missouri Department of Conservation's designated Conservation Opportunity Areas (COA). Since IBA's are important for migrating and breeding birds, the St. Louis Audubon Society and other Audubon affiliates hope to assure that conservation goals for these areas are met.

Of the general management proposals for ONSR, the St. Louis Audubon Society recommends Alternative B, opposing Alternatives A and C. Because the conflicting nature of many of the current activities are degrading the stream banks and water quality, we support stronger management and control with regard to access enforcement and habitat restoration. We agree with policies that restrict access by all-terrain vehicles, decrease horse volumes, and increase enforcement efforts at unauthorized access points. Plan B also supports resource monitoring, research and preservation projects that are critical to inform both future NPS management plans as well as provide the most accurate information to area visitors. We also support the proposal for wilderness designation of the Big Spring section.

In addition, we feel that the NPS has the deepest knowledge of its own capabilities and which management plan is most likely to be realistically and successfully implemented in the ONSR. Our support of Plan B reflects our vote of confidence in the NPS preferred plan.

The enjoyment, beauty and benefit of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will be dependent on it remaining as natural and wildlife-diverse as possible while continuing to provide well-managed recreational and educational opportunities for visitors.

Sincerely,  
Jean P. Favara  
Vice President of Conservation  
St. Louis Audubon Society  
jpouf1@swbell.net

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2591 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 11:37:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe that at this time the best choice would be the no action plan. The actions in the alternative plans would not be the best option for this area. More laws and restrictions will take away from the enjoyment of this beautiful area. The park service should work on following the current rules before trying to add more.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2592 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 11:38:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to start of by saying I'm a say as a fourth generation Shannon County resident. Having grown up being able to enjoy the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, and also taking my own children to enjoy them, I cant imagine not being able to continue these pleasures. My family enjoys camping, boat riding and campfire stories in the summer, as well as gigging and campfires in the winter.

Now that is just my family's personal enjoyment. Looking at it a whole picture, I also worry about what will happen to our community if these changes are made. I'm sure we will loses many of our local business, Canoe vendors, campground and even local stores as well as gas station will feel this financially. I have seen first hand all my life the locals as well as the tourist that use our rivers. People bring their families to camp, float , ride horse just to enjoy a little bit of nature.

I would ask that you consider the no action plan.

Sincerely,  
Sherrie Keeling

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2593 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 11:40:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a locally concerned citizen. I Would like to STRONGLY recommend the NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE. Here is my opinion: This area -land and river- is what I have grown up with. I use both and take care of it as well. I clean -not only what I take but what others leave behind. This is valuable heritage from my prior ansestors that took care of the land/river and I want it to be the same for my children. I have been here my whole life (38 years) and the river is one of the most important things to me. I don't want to vacation in other areas. I camp, swim, boat ride, picnic, hike all right HERE! Boating limits do not need to be changed. Boats save alot of people each year. A small size horse power wouldn't be able to handle some areas of the river. I also pay taxes that are used for this National Park to be used. It is "WE THE PEOPLES" land. I live right here and shouldn't have to fight what is out my back door. People in other areas shouldn't have an influence on something that they don't see or use every day. I want my childern, grandchildren and future generations to have the same wonderful memories that I have from being raised using this beautiful area the same way I do.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2594 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 11:43:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the NPS preferred alternative - B. It strikes a balance between future improvement while protecting the resource and providing recreation and income to the region. It will help restore the area by closing a good amount of unauthorized roads and trails that are impacting the watershed and just the natural beauty of the landscape.

Some folks say the NPS has not been able to enforce the rules so why set new ones and they support the "No change alternative". Enforcement could be improved under all the alternatives. But past performance should not shut out a plan to move forward and improve the resource. The facts support that the resource is degrading. Supporting "no change" means supporting continued damage.

Let's work together to move forward to save this treasure and not let it slide into further peril by not changing how it is managed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2595    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 11:47:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been frequenting the Current River since 1988. I canoe and trail ride horses in the area. Since that time, I feel that the trash in the river has vastly improved. The only problems I see when visiting that area is rude, obnoxious, drunken people canoeing. There is also some erosion where horse and 4-wheelers use the trails. I am all for officials working with the Back Woods Trail Rider groups to help maintain the trails. We tried to start a group like that last fall, but met with a landowner who opposed it and threatened to shut down trails on private lands which are used by many trail riders. I oppose closing any horseback trails. I also believe fish gigging and trapping should continue. I do not participate in these activities, but know many people who do and it is a tradition that has gone on for decades for these families. I do not see how this keeps others from enjoying the river as well. I do not support any new Wilderness Areas being established for any reason whatsoever. This is not needed or wanted. In my opinion, things should stay as they have been. There are several thriving canoeing and horse back riding businesses that greatly benefit people having access and enjoying the area. They need to be protected at all costs in my opinion. I know many of these individuals and they do a lot to protect the river and make it a fun place to visit.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2596    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 11:48:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Mountain Biking has become a very popular sport in recent years. It is a sport enjoyed by people of all ages, but primarily those of middle age with money. Mountain Biking could generate a lot of revenue for the area. These folks are invested in their equipment and the sport and willing to travel for great trails. Mountain Bikers do not shy away from hard work. The bike clubs and other individuals could be used to help maintain the trails. Our local bike club, Greenhills Trail Association is solely responsible for building and maintaining the local 10 mile single track in Indian Creek Conservation Area. These trails can also be easily shared with hikers. Mountain Biking is a relatively safe sport.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2597    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 11:56:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please consider my below comments as sincere and genuine.

I appreciate the attention given to and consideration for mountain biking and other trail uses within the General Management Plan, and urge you to give increased consideration for mountain biking in this and future plans. I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways. I urge you to allow mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in this and future plans, wherever possible and appropriate.

Well-designed mountain bike trails are sustainable and do not have adverse environmental impacts when properly constructed in the right locations. In fact, their environmental impact is often far lower than other trail options- for instance, equestrian trails.

I feel that the current situation, with mountain biking disallowed on all existing trails and bicycling on area roads discouraged by the Scenic Riverways web page, does not allow visitors the full range of recreation options that are normally available at similar state and national parks across the nation. Allowing substantial mountain bike access in areas where it is appropriate would be a very important improvement in this area.

Missouri has a large and active mountain biking population that will very much use and appreciate these trails and access to this beautiful area, if it is provided.

I encourage you to involve bicycling and mountain biking groups when making decisions about trail access in the Scenic Riverways area.

Mountain biking, and biking in general, is a family event for my family and many other families we know. It's a fantastic way to enjoy what nature provides us while also being healthy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2598    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 11:56:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support implementation of the draft general management plan. As a floater and long-time supporter of Missouri wilderness, I think that protection of these lovely streams and the surrounding forests is of great urgency. Please keep these streams clear, clean and free-flowing.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2599    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 11:59:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a retired Ecologist with 40 years of professional experience with state and federal land management agencies. This background has provided me with an understanding of the frequent separation of statutory direction and cultural/societal induced legislation that creates management issues for such agencies. In my view, the Ozark Scenic Riverways is no exception.

The enabling Federal Legislation establishing the Park was, at best, a compromise between competing interests that had initially worked in concert to defeat the Corps plans for impoundment, but held different values and views following deauthorization. The current Park environment has been a consequence of such divergent views, a divergence which will likely be seen in the comments provided on this draft.

It seems that the initial management efforts of the NPS were directed toward ameliorating local distrust and anger while providing the recreational experience sought by people largely from other areas. The result, as I have observed from my experiences in trying to "have it both ways" while employed by both federal and state management agencies is that the steady creep toward ever increasing public use causes an increase in cumulative and long term degradation of the very resources the agency was established to protect.

In my view, the NPS is now at the cusp of realizing this trend. Your selection of a Management Plan for the near term will determine the fate of the resources under your mandate well into the latter half of this century.

In this respect, I view the draft plan efforts as being extremely myopic in both the scope of discussion of matters beyond the direct control of the NPS and in matters of unintended consequences of the array of planning alternatives.

With respect for the external matters beyond NPS control: (1) In many respects the resource features of the Park are of a riverbasin or landscape scale. Water quality for example is not the product of the management efforts within the Park, but of topographic features that make up the watersheds above the Park and for aquifer recharge areas outside Park boundaries. What prerogatives does the Park Management have for inducing positive future outcomes for these important inputs to Park conditions? (2) A review of negative cumulative impacts to natural resources as a consequence from past and present Park management over and about recreational values would aid in assessing the anticipated recovery under any proposed plan option.

In view of my concerns expressed briefly in this paragraph, would the Park view the potential for a National River Basin designation of Heritage Basin as a potential win-win over the long term for both internal and external Park interests. In other words, would thinking "outside the present box" be a viable alternative to discuss with stakeholders during the Plan life?

My own professional view of Park problems stems from an assignment I had while on the staff of the Missouri Department of Conservation. In the early 1980's. I had been assigned to coordinate Department concerns with the

Department of Natural Resources' effort to revise the Clean Water Plan. A desire to include "recreational values" into the new plan presented the problem of how to determine existing and future values. I formed a sub-committee of myself, Daniel Witter and Jay Martindale and together we conducted a Delphi opinion poll of Natural Resource Agency staffers within the State who would have local views on the subject based on their observations. The result was published in 1982 by the MDC as :Ranking the recreational values and associated problems of Missouri's major watersheds. That report listed the Current and Jacks Fork River as very high if not top ranked for the early 1980's, but projected a considerable drop in value 20 years hence due to overuse. This I offer as the views of professionals in the field as opposed to conventional stakeholders.

In summary, I see the no action plan as not an option as well as plan C. The NPS's desired plan present a least "discomfort" option for the agency professionals, but in reality does little to ameliorate the unaddressed problems I see appearing in the near future; increased population growth and climate impacts.

Option A would most like please many Park advocates and users, but is also apt to create political ramifications beyond the Parks control. I therefore suggest a hybrid option that features transitory management strategies over a near term range.

Maintaining the Park lands and water as a living museum or as a area literally "loved to death" are not options. Therefore reformulating a flexible plan between the extremes would be my preferred option.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2600    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 12:00:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is the heart of natural beauty in Missouri and is long-overdue for common-sense protections. It shouldn't be over-exploited for economic gain nor should it be "loved to death". The Current and Jacks Fork rivers need more protection from illegal roads, misuse by ATV's and excessive horse traffic. I applaud the NPS for their planning efforts.

I have loved this area since my first canoe floats in the 1980's and feel privileged to have know this area.

I support Alternative A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2601    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 12:01:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Consistent with the comment letter I previously provided, in general, I support Aternative B.

Also, I am in favor of additional study on replacing the low-water bridge at Cedar Grove with a high-water bridge. I think this could possibly improve habitat upstream of the bridge. I also support studying whether improvements to the wastewater treatment systems within the park's facilities are needed.

Thank you for allowing the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Jay Hoskins

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2602    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 12:10:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a Saint Louis, MO resident and Salem, MO native that has spent many hours in the ONSR. I have participated in many different recreation activities, from canoeing, boating, and fishing to camping, riding atvs, biking, and hiking. I spent almost every Saturday and some Sunday afternoons on the Current River while in high school and college. I am also a civil engineer that works in the chemical industry and understands the importance of efforts made to maintain the river and ensure that the resource is protected. What I do not understand is the decisions that are being made without any substantive data to back them up. The NPS has done this in the past,

such as the efforts to ban bluff jumping which were ill conceived, backed up by reasons that were completely based on emotional perceptions of a certain set of park visitors, and completely unenforceable and unrealistic. The statement of purpose for the ONSR is as follows:

The "Ozark National Scenic Riverways was created through congressional legislation on August 24, 1964 (by Public Law 88-492) to conserve and interpret the scenic, natural, scientific, ecological, and historic values and resources within the National Riverways, and to provide for public outdoor recreational use and enjoyment of those resources."

To me, this means that the park should be maintained in a way that allows the majority of users to use the park for recreation in the method of their choosing while ensuring that none of these methods do irreparable harm to the resource itself. This means that any attempt to limit a recreation activity should be backed up by data that shows a correlation between a particular type of recreation and how it contributes to degrading the resource in an unsustainable manner. While some may argue that data is included in the draft management plans, I would argue that the plans insert passages that claim to be scientific fact, but that are not backed up by any type of graphic showing correlations or by engineering formulae. This type of justification would not be considered in any professional circumstance as the basis for a large decision such as choosing the park management plan. The approach that is used in the plans uses generalizations and clichés about saving resources, wildlife etc. to entice readers to make decisions based on emotions and not based on evidence, because little to no real evidence is provided.

"It is a capital mistake to theorize before one has data. Insensibly one begins to twist facts to suit theories, instead of theories to suit facts."

— Arthur Conan Doyle, Sherlock Holmes

Without data there is no way anyone could make an informed decision about the future of the ONSR.

One question that I have is why the NPS chose to even call one plan the "preferred plan"? This gives the NPS a strong incentive to twist facts and user input to support their preferred alternative instead of choosing the plan based on user input that was guided by factual information. Now it will look like the NPS lost a battle if the preferred plan is not chosen, which will cause many involved with the plan's creation to feel as if they are losing face, when in fact it should be a victory for the NPS because it is representing the will of the people while conserving a resource. To call one plan preferred was completely disingenuous and is not the democratic approach that should have been taken by the NPS.

After reviewing the NPS GMP draft plans, I feel compelled to say that I do not support any of the plans they have proposed as they are currently constructed. I want to give them my support in protecting that resource, but I do not feel that their preferred alternative (Alternative B) from their draft plan will succeed in that. Generally speaking, all the alternatives are too vague to really establish a strong path forward for the ONSR. They focus more on the zoning of areas within the park rather than specific measures on how they propose to make the park better.

## GEOMORPHOLOGY

I was sorely disappointed to see that the draft General Management Plan did not cover the geomorphology of the Riverways. All that I could find in the document concerning geomorphology is reference to the karst geomorphology that provides the area with so many unique springs. While the karst features are an important aspect of the park that needs to be preserved there is more that should have been covered.

It is impossible for the National Park Service to make educated and informed decisions on what impacts the Riverways, the gravel bars, and the adjacent floodplains without first understanding the geomorphology that drives this system. Historical accounts of the river state that there used to be very few gravel bars within the system and that the channel contained more of a bedrock bottom. I see no evidence that shows the park understands what has caused this change, how it is continuing to change, and how the Riverways should be managed in an environment that is actively changing. I have my obvious opinions on this; however, they are just opinions. The park should solicit research from professional geologists and engineers to study this dynamic process of geomorphology in this region so that they can make informed decisions on how activities (such as canoeing, motor boating, off road vehicle use, etc.) along the river are impacting the resource. If recreational activities are adversely impacting the

geomorphologic processes along the Riverways, then those activities should see some form of restriction from the park service.

## FLOATING

Without question, canoeing is the chief recreational activity within the ONSR. People flock to the Riverways from all across the nation to float the beautiful Current & Jacks Fork River.

Some people think that certain sections of the Riverways face many issues from overcrowding of the floaters. From my personal perspective, I think there are times during the summer when the Riverways are "overcrowded" from the canoers, kayakers, rafters, and tubers. I hate to see large crowds of people coming down the river when I choose to spend my time down there. However, all people have a right to come recreate on the Riverways. It was preserved for everyone's use. Just because I don't like seeing large crowds of people down there doesn't necessarily mean that those large crowds negatively impact the resource.

Obviously, the more people that are in a natural environment, the more opportunities you have to impact the environment. The question that the park should seek to answer is the following questions about this user group:

â€¢ Does this user group impacting the Riverways?

â€¢ How can this user group impact the Riverways?

â€¢ What is a suitable number of floaters, at any given time, on a scenic river set aside for recreation?

â€¢ Does this user group impact water quality beyond a safe standard?

â€¢ Does this user group negatively impact the geomorphology?

I don't have these specific answers. Sadly, I'm afraid the park doesn't either. I feel that since this park was designated as a national recreational area that as many floaters as possible should be allowed to recreate within the boundaries of the park at any given time, until the point where they negatively impact the resource. It's on the parks shoulders to clearly articulate what constitutes a negative impact to the resource from floaters.

## MOTORIZED BOATS

The use of motorized boats within the boundaries of the ONSR is a very popular activity amongst people who live near the Riverways.

All of the proposed alternatives wish to restrict motorized boats within the boundaries of the ONSR. Specifically, the NPS preferred alternative (Alternative B) seeks to completely eliminate the use of motorized boats on Current River above the Pulltite Access. Why does the NPS seek to restrict the use of motorized boats along the Riverways? Is there some sort of evidence that motorized boats are negatively impacting the resource? With the ONSR being designated as a national recreation area, the park should not seek to restrict activities where there is no evidence that they are impacting the resource. If the park has evidence that motorized boats cause damage to the resource then it should have been specifically and concisely presented in their draft GMP.

The only real justification by the NPS to restrict motorized boats I can find in the draft GMP is the following statement:

The restriction of motorized boats "would help reduce motorboat disturbances to aquatic habitat (such as displaced aquatic vegetation, fish spawning impacts, and petroleum-based water pollution) and motorboat noise disturbance to riparian habitat and wildlife behavior (such as bird nesting and bird communication)."

In all the pages of the draft GMP, I see no data to support this statement made by the NPS. Furthermore, if these are true concerns, how do other Riverways users (canoes, kayakers, hikers, horse riders, etc.) affect them? If the NPS feels so strongly that motorized boats impact the resource in this manner, maybe they should lead the way in not utilizing them for their day-to-day functions within the park.

If there is not data that shows motorized boats impact the river, why did the NPS seek to restrict the usage of them? I assume it is because they received comments during the GMP process where individuals voiced opinions opposed to motorized boats within the park. I again revert back to my statement that decisions should be based on data and not how one set of users wants to define the resource.



## ROADS AND TRAILS WITHIN THE PARK BOUNDARIES

The Code of Federal Regulation does allow for some off-road vehicle use within parks that are deemed national recreation areas (36 CFR - Section 4.10 b). Many responsible individuals use vehicles to access their favorite areas within the park boundaries in a responsible manner that does not impact the resource.

The ONSR has done a terrible job at identifying the official roads and trails within the park boundaries. Nowhere in the draft GMP or the official website for the ONSR can I find where the NPS identifies what are and are not the official roads within the boundaries on the park. In this technological age it requires minimal effort to develop maps to display this information and disseminate to the public.

## RIVER ACCESS POINTS

River accesses are an important topic to many individuals. There are many different views on how many access points there should be along the river and what areas should be access points. In the draft GMP the NPS would seek the following with their preferred alternative (Alternative B):

"Concession dropoff and pickup locations for river users utilizing nonmotorized watercraft would be redistributed to reduce peak-season crowding effects and to protect river resources in response to potential changes in river flow conditions. This would require closure and restoration of about 20 access points and the careful design and opening of 20 new designated access points. Total designated access points would remain constant or decrease."

There are many problems I have with the above statement primarily revolving around its ambiguity. What access points would you look to "decrease" or close? What do you mean by "restoration" of access points? Which 20 access points with the ONSR have been identified for this?

It is impossible for individuals to know how you plan to manage the Riverways Access points with the above information. Access points along the Riverways should be built-up to support the recreational needs of the park visitors. By that I do not mean that every access point needs to be paved with concrete or have a boat ramp put in.

I do not believe that the cost to change access points along the river, whether it is to close or open them will be justified by the results of doing so, and see little reason to believe otherwise.

## HORSES AND TRAIL RIDES

Possibly the second largest user group, behind floaters, in the ONSR are horse riders. Unfortunately due to the expanse of this user group, they have collectively begun to degrade the water quality of the Riverways. Particularly the Jacks Fork River between Eminence and its confluence with the Current River has seen the most damage

I believe that this is something that needs to be brought under control. In my opinion the way to do that is to control horse crossing points and develop rules that prohibit horses from loitering in the river so they have less opportunity to defecate in the water. If the problem persists, the number of horses allowed in the park might have to be limited.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2603	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 12:19:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors and increase commerce for local business'

Thanks for your time  
Tony Caruso

Bike Stop Cafe

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2604    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 12:20:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Let the people ride bikes and see the wonders of this planet we live upon !!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2605    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 12:24:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

I'm an avid bicyclist and enjoy touring Missouri on a bicycle. Allowing bicycling in the Riverways would increase and enhance my visits to the area.

Thanks for you consideration.

Sincerely,  
Dan Frey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2606    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 12:29:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

The additional park visitors will help local Missouri business in the areas around the parks as people buy supplies and meals.

It's a win-win for Missouri and Cyclists!

Thanks,

Steve

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2607    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 12:31:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family has lived in Shannon County since the early 1800 and I have deep roots to the area. I feel like the new proposed General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways does not reflect our

Heritage or the local comments that was made by over 5000 people in 2009. In 1971 when the enabling legislation was signed into law we initially had approximately three million visitors to the riverways in the late seventy's and eighty's. The latest figures that I was told that our visitors are down to a little over one million each year due to different poor management and excessive regulation. Today people are mobile and are able to choose where they can receive the best visitor experience. It is important that our visitors receive the best visitors experience possible. Shannon County is one of the lowest income per capita and one of the most severely impacted by the amount of government and absentee landowners in the United States. I believe that it is the desire of the local residents as well as the majority of the United States that the economy and job creation are our number one priority and I do not believe this plan shows any evidence that that has been addressed. Please keep our roads and trails open and well maintained, keep all campgrounds open with services provided and well maintained and no more regulations on motor craft than is already in place. We need more local employment for our residents so they will not have to drive outside the area or relocate. We need a plan that specifically addresses these issues and concerns, that has made the local economy a top priority.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2608    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 12:32:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please realize that the loud, 'squeaking wheel' of outcry against the Nation Park Service and Ozark National Scenic Riverways is NOT the opinion of everyone who lives near and enjoys the Riverways. While some think the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers belong solely to those who reside in the immediate area, the area is a NATIONAL park and belongs to everyone, whether local or visitor. Sometimes it seems to be the local, not the visitor who takes the rivers for granted since they've 'always been there.'

Some adjusting in the preferred option would be nice- -such as the motor boat limits on the upper Current. Just because a trail has been used for many seasons, does not make it a recognized trail or a well-maintained trail that will not wash in heavy rains. If some trails are closed, it's because they are illegally built; there are other trails for horse back riding.

The reason the original plan did not address the use of ATVs and other off-road vehicles, is that they weren't common or even existed when the original plan was written. Times change, new things are developed, and management plans need to change and be adjusted to accommodate these changes.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2609    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 12:33:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am very much in support opening the trails of the Ozark Scenic Waterways Area to mountain bikers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2610    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 12:34:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Previous to my retirement, I worked for the National Park Service for twenty years as a Landscape Architect. During my tenure (1990-2010) I spent eleven years at Ozark National Scenic Riverways in Southeast Missouri.

Our nation's National Parks, all of them, are managed under the dichotomous mission to protect and preserve those natural features and cultural/historical legacies deemed to be of 'exceptional value' for the benefit and enjoyment of all its citizens- --while simultaneously insuring that these exceptional values will not be compromised, will remain intact for generations to come. Critical to ensuring that what was originally set aside (be it a Civil War battlefield, a grand canyon, an ancient virgin forest, or a scenic river) a park's management plan must set the parameters for how this interface- --between 'public use' and the 'valued resource' (natural, historic, or cultural) will occur. It implies limits. And it implies an assessment of resource conditions and a commitment to monitoring such impacts to that resource due to 'use'. But above all it implies that the core values of 'that place' (a place that was originally 'set aside' as a National Park) are retained.

The existing Management Plan (1989) for Ozark National Scenic Riverways (presented in the current Draft Management Plan as the 'No-Action Alternative') specifically states the need for an additional inventory and assessment of park roads/trails (including horse trails and hiking trails). A Roads and Trails 'Study' was done in 1994, but by the time I joined the management staff at Ozark National Scenic Riverways in 1999, this study was obsolete and inaccurate. Incremental expansion and proliferation of 'unplanned' road access to numerous points along both the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers had already occurred, and continues to occur. In addition, miles of ad hoc horse trails crisscrossed the narrow park. 'Use'- --undefined and in the absence of resource assessment was the norm. At last, a new General Management Plan is about to be signed and implemented. It cannot be too soon!

If 'use' is to be a viable component of preserving and conserving a treasured place of value (now and in the future)- -if indeed we intend to allow that this 'place' will be there, intact, 'cared-for'- --then discreet limits of use are not constraints- --they are undertaken by the 'user' as a necessary and beneficial part of his/her experience. This is NOT to say that I, as an individual, might not after all really enjoy activities that could cause a little erosion or disturb a bit of habitat. On a very small scale- --I could justify that- --couldn't I?

Perhaps I have a desire to saddle up and ride my horse to the river, to cross the river (even though the bank may be steep, even though a spring fed stream enters the river at that point). Perhaps I have a desire to hop on my ATV and ride the riffles a mile or two upstream mid-river if the water is shallow enough. Perhaps I have a desire to roll my vehicle out to a gravel bar in the middle of the river to set up camp and fish. Perhaps I know where I can back my trailer up to the river bank to launch my boat at a place where it is less crowded. Perhaps I desire to run my motor boat at top speed- --feel the wind in my face- --wild and free. Its OK to want to do any of these things isn't it? Why shouldn't I be 'free' to do what I might enjoy? After all- --enjoyment is a 'right'- -- -isn't it? I have 'rights' don't I? If its public land- --its my land (as a citizen) to do what I enjoy- --and its my 'right'. Right? It is NOT wrong that a person would find such activities 'enjoyable'. But there is a problem.

The relationship to a 'valued place' - --to a forest, a river, a mountain, a quiet cove, a gravel bar, a cave, a homestead- --is only minimally about 'rights'. If you care ABOUT something- --then you care FOR it. If you value a place, it is not about rights it's about RESPONSIBILITY. And responsibility requires respect, it is aided by knowledge- --and it fosters constraint (a word that implies self-limits and considered caution).

I am but one individual. I care very very much about Ozark National Scenic Riverways National Park. I lived there, I worked there. I care very much for the people of the southeast Missouri Ozarks, for those whose family 'homeplace' has been along the length of the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers for many generations. I care very much about this 'special place', though I now live very far away.

I am in support and prefer the selection of Alternative A.

If not Alternative A- -- -then Alternative B. I note, further, that whichever Alternative (A,B,or C) if signed and approved will ONLY be as viable as a consequent commitment to allocate adequate staffing and project/research funding. Any General Management Plan that is not adequately funded will be little more than an exercise in stating good intentions. As a citizen and as a tax payer- --I request that sufficient tax dollars should go towards adequately funding the recommendations set forth in the new General Management Plan (be it A, B, or C). Further, the No-Action Alternative is, without a doubt, a base-line from which the other three options may be measured. The No-Action Alternative (i.e. the existing General Management Plan) is NOT a sufficient instrument to carry conscientious management of this remarkable park on into the 21st century.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2611	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 12:36:08
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I write this in support of the NPS' management plan which appears to be the most viable and fair compromise between local business entities and the need to protect the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and this beautiful but neglected national park.
------------------------	---

I have been using the Current and Jacks Fork rivers all of my life ( I am 49 years old). I have watched them be decimated by those who do not respect the beauty and fragile ecosystems and watershed. I have spent many hours cleaning up waste left behind by those who drive in with their trucks and leave behind their trash.

I have been intentionally "swamped" by apparent "locals" who enjoy tipping non-motorized boats (canoes/kayaks) as they speed by in John boats, often with a beer (clearly not their first or only of the day) in hand.

I have had to choose other destinations because of e-coil dangers in the Jacks Fork river created by too many horses on the trails.

There is a saying, "if you always do what you always did, you always get what you always got." It is time to change the way of doing things in that Park. If it left to the locals, there would be no management and consequently, I believe, there would be no park. Clearly, the local businesses have not monitored themselves which to a large degree has led us to this place in time.

This Park belongs to all Americans, not just to those who live around the park. I strongly urge the passage of the management plan supported by the National Park Service.

It is incumbent upon our representatives to promote the care of this beautiful property.

Sincerely,  
Nancy J. Higgins

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2612	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 12:44:49				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Alternative B will effectively balance ecological/preservation concerns with the need to allow citizens to visit and enjoy their national park. I am convinced that the current operations of ONSR are not sustainable. Alternative A would create an ecologically sustainable management system, but it would greatly reduce the ability of visitors to explore and enjoy their park. This would cause devastating harm to the local communities and economies that depend on the park. Alternative C would allow easy access but would cause further harm to the ecosystems, historical preservation, and natural resources of the park. If the National Park Services takes no action to protect our natural resources, these resources will not be available for the enjoyment of future generations. Our enjoyment of our national park lands has a serious impact on the ecosystems, waterways, and landscapes that make up these lands. If we want to preserve lands for the enjoyment of our children and grandchildren, then we need to make sure that we manage them in a wise, sustainable way.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2613	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 12:49:12				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 7, 2014				

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to express my support of the Draft General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I have been enjoying the ONSR for my entire life around 32 years and have been very discouraged by the things I've seen happening in recent years.

It can take me anywhere from 3-4 hours to get to the National Scenic Riverways and it is very frustrating to make that trip and spend it hoards of people who are riding in rafts build for white water rafting that they use as boats they do not have to paddle so they can drink and party all the while disrupting the serenity of nature and peacefulness others are trying to enjoy. I am not advocating to ban liquor just finding a reasonable way to prevent people coming to the river with no intentions of enjoying nature and our beautiful park. The constant mess left by people who drive their vehicles and ATVs right down to the water is frustrating as well. Lastly I do not wish to outlaw horses but please limit the number of trails and locations meant for horses. Their river crossings and waste can also pose issues for our beautiful riverways.

I currently support the option for Alternative A but would find Alternative B acceptable as well for future management of our beautiful riverways. There are plenty of additional rivers for people to enjoy utilizing the above

mentioned issues without being within the confines of a National Park area.

I truly want to be able to teach and offer my son and grandkids the things I was afforded growing up on the National Scenic Riverways. Please consider tightening the rules/regulations to protect our great treasure.

Sincerely,

Zach McDonald

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2614    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** FRIENDS OF OZARK RIVERWAYS COMMENTS ON  
THE OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS (ONSR)  
DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Friends of Ozark Riverways has reviewed the draft General Management Plan (GMP) and considered its various management alternatives. We applaud the National Park Service for addressing many of the issues that have been festering at ONSR for years.

WHAT IS FRIENDS OF OZARK RIVERWAYS (FOR)? FOR formed in 2003 to promote respectful management of Ozark National Scenic Riverways. FOR is a coalition of conservation, outdoor, and recreation-based organizations and businesses, along with thousands of individuals who share the mission to protect the outstanding natural beauty, ecological vitality, and rich cultural history of the Riverways so that visitors are rewarded with high quality experiences and future generations will have the same opportunity.

We encourage the strengthening of this park's operation. If well cared for, the Riverways will not only protect priceless natural and cultural resources but also provide substantial economic contributions to the region from jobs, visitor spending, added sales tax revenue, and national park expenditures and thus sustain small communities along the river.

This park's problems have included the seemingly ever-expanding presence of motorized vehicles and their maze of eroded tracks in riparian areas and on gravel bars; the explosive growth of equestrian use and proliferation of undesignated trails and river crossings (many of which are in sensitive riverine areas or on steep, heavily-eroded slopes); overcrowding in certain reaches of the rivers and resulting conflicts among user groups, coupled with the rowdy behavior of some visitors; and inadequate monitoring and enforcement of scenic easements. Doing nothing would result in further degradation of resources and conflict among uses, and diminish the economic potential that a well-managed national park, its scenic landscapes, and clean streams and rivers can provide.

**PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE:** FOR agrees with NPS that alternative B provides the most balance among the three alternatives. Alternative B would provide more staff for maintenance, monitoring, and enforcement while substantially enhancing visitor experience of park resources. We believe that several improvements could strengthen the plan:

• **SCENIC EASEMENTS.** Although there are no changes to scenic easements proposed in this plan there are 9,257 acres of scenic easements that are intended to maintain the natural environment and scenery for the benefit of the visiting public. These easements are critical to the quality of the Riverways. They were acquired to add public value to the national park and need to be effectively monitored in a timely manner. Easement violations must be corrected promptly.

• **WILDERNESS.** The GMP review includes one small, undeveloped backcountry/wildland area of approximately 3400 acres near Big Spring. The area, which was acquired as a state park in the 1920s and later became part of the ONSR, has been continually managed as an undeveloped wild area and we support that approach. We also support the use of prescribed fire to manage wildland quality. The NPS is proposing in each alternative to recommend some portion of the Big Spring area as qualified for federal wilderness protection. Management would continue largely

unchanged as it has been but with the recognition that it can provide a true wilderness experience, which would be an addition to riverways offerings. We support the NPS-preferred Alternative B, which recommends 3430 acres for wilderness management, while recognizing that official designation as federal wilderness is beyond the scope of the ONSR plan.

â€HORSEPOWER LIMIT: Zoning for horsepower limits has been part of existing regulations since the River Use Management Plan of 1989. Some members of FOR support the proposed non-motorized section on the upper stretches of the Current and Jacks Fork year-round. Others support seasonal use of motors for traditional activities such as fishing and gigging and believe this is appropriate in these sections during fall and winter. (NPS recognizes that the present and proposed 60/40 horsepower limit is in violation of the Code of Federal Regulations and is proposing a rule-change process in order to continue allowing it.)

â€HIKING TRAILS. There are so few hiking trails in this park and the additional miles provided in alternative B are so small that we urge ONSR to partner with other agencies and organizations to develop hiking trails across multiple ownerships.

â€HORSE CAMPGROUND. Instead of the new 25-site horse campground proposed for alternative B, we ask that NPS work with existing local businesses to provide a concession horse camping operation on private land outside the park that would have less impact on park resources within the narrow river corridor and contribute more to the local economy.

â€NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT. FOR strongly supports the protection, restoration and interpretation of natural landscapes, archaeological sites, historic structures, and cultural landscapes as discussed in this plan. However, our support for cultural landscape restoration is limited to the immediate viewshed of historic sites. Restoring and stabilizing the forested riparian corridor should be emphasized, especially in view of the likely impact of climate change and severe weather events on the rivers and floodplains. There should be no new conversions of bottomland riparian forests to open fields, and artificial pasture for elk and other wildlife should be eschewed; restoration of upland meadows, woodlands, and glades should be with native vegetation.

â€RIVERBANK ISSUES. Impaired riverbanks should be restored. Developed facilities along the rivers should be carefully considered, screened from view from the river wherever possible, and low impact. We suggest that heavily engineered solutions be avoided (e.g., rock and weirs) but that NPS use its talent and experience to bring to this park natural landscape design and sustainable structures appropriate to the site.

â€PRIORITIZE SOLUTIONS FOR PROBLEM AREAS. One such problem area is across from Welch Spring. Park development has been concentrated on the left bank descending from Cedar Grove to Akers Ferry. The sizeable river bottom along the right bank is remote and undeveloped but has been overrun and severely degraded by motor vehicles on a maze of unauthorized, heavily rutted roads and traces. This area should remain undeveloped and its seriously impaired places restored. Damaged areas such as these should not serve as opportunity to add new 'hardened' development where it does not belong. This sizable area should serve as a high quality visual resource for floaters and for other users viewing it from the developed area long established at Welch Spring.

â€ANNUAL VISITATION AND ECONOMIC INFLUENCE. Visitation is about 1.3-1.5 million each year. A 2011 study estimated visitor spending at \$55,445,000, more than 88 percent of which is by non-local visitors. This spending combined with NPS employment accounted for 845 jobs, or 16 percent of total employment in Shannon and Carter counties. We support this high-value investment in the Ozark region of south-central Missouri, understanding that a well-managed park and the visitors it attracts may be the most important contributors to the long-term economic health of local communities.

SUMMARY COMMENTS. Though people will differ in their views of which alternative is best, we believe that the National Park Service has provided a very reasonable range of alternatives in this plan and deserves support for its commitment to dealing with serious problems that have developed over the years. However, the Riverways has seen a 30 percent reduction in staff in the last decade, owing to decreases in funding, and there is no guarantee that funds will be enhanced to the levels anticipated by the plan alternatives. That is one reason for cautioning against the increased development and more intense recreational use in Alternative C that would require more increases in staffing to monitor resources and provide enforcement. We favor maintaining visitation at approximately the current

level while emphasizing improvements that are less staff-intensive and more conducive to family recreation.

Respectfully submitted by the Steering Committee of Friends of Ozark Riverways  
www.CurrentRiverFriends.org

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2615    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 12:51:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We would like to express our concerns with any changes to the current management plan. We support the No-Action alternative and continuation of the current management plan. The current plan can deal with any concerns or issues raised.  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2616    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 12:52:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I vote for the No Action Plan. I am an active outdoorsman and use the ONSR often. I believe that we have enough regulations on the streams and do not wish to encourage more regulations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2617    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe that the Open Fields Management should still be in effect. This is not addressed in the GMP. It was an agreement that the park had with MDC. I also believe that roads should be maintained with parking areas so that you could get in there to fish and hunt. There needs to be a full staff of maintenance in the winter time so that campgrounds and facilities can be repairs/rehabbed without people using them. I do not agree with the no motor zones. The whole river should be the 60/40 motors and let the river itself limit the boats. People have always fished and gigged in the areas that are labeled no boat zones. It is another way in which the park is trying to take our traditions away. There needs to be electric campsites at Pulltite and many more in the Round spring area, in a better location (in the shade, more level, less concrete).  
I am a 10 year seasonal employee with the park and I see lots of room for improvement. Rumors abound when the park does not communicate well with its employees and local people.  
Park employees with good evaluations should be given preference over new hires for jobs. I know that other parks use local hire authority rather than nation wide announcements. The reason that people want the state parks to take back the river is because they have much better facilities that we do. They are preparing to build a new campground and cabins at the Zoe property. The park should have take the Presley Center for an educational center when MDC offered it to the park. We need a lot more staff in the field, maintenance, le and interp rangers, and fewer jobs at HQ. Headquarters staff has doubled and the field staff shrunk over the years. I see that all the options call for more staff, but is there funding for any improvements? Unkept promises makes the park look bad.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2618    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 12:55:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am urging you to make no change in the management plan except to consider giving the control of the area back to Missouri.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2619    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 12:55:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please open access to mountain bikers. Avid mountain bikers know how to take care of trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2620    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 12:58:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form



**Correspondence:** I OPPOSE this proposal to appease enviromentalists by limiting the public use and enjoyment of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2621 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 13:12:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the attention given to and consideration for mountain biking and other trail uses within the General Management Plan, and urge you to give increased consideration for mountain biking in this and future plans. I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways. I urge you to allow mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in this and future plans, wherever possible and appropriate.

Well-designed mountain bike trails are sustainable and do not have adverse environmental impacts when properly constructed in the right locations. In fact, their environmental impact is often far lower than other trail options- -for instance, equestrian trails.

I feel that the current situation, with mountain biking disallowed on all existing trails and bicycling on area roads discouraged by the Scenic Riverways web page, does not allow visitors the full range of recreation options that at normally available at similar state and national parks across the nation. Allowing substantial mountain bike access in areas where it is appropriate would be a very important improvement in this area.

Missouri has a large and active mountain biking population that will very much use and appreciate these trails and access to this beautiful area, if it is provided.

I encourage you to involve bicycling and mountain biking groups when making decisions about trail access in the Scenic Riverways area.

Also, many Mountain Bikers throughout the state are members of local organizations that meet to build, maintain, and promote proper use of trails statewide in conjunction with state, local and private land management organizations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2622 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 13:14:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I request a NO ACTION ! The water ways should be under control of the state of Missouri. Land owners are far better guardians of our waterways than any federal agency or NGO will ever be.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2623 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 13:14:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the initiative to allow mountain bikers to use the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2624 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 13:19:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I encourage that the Proposed General Management Plan, in any of the three presented alternatives, not restrict the use of ATVs within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. This mode of transportation enables individuals access to the beauty and wonders of the Riverways. I have enjoyed the Ozarks for many years by this means and have not witnessed abuse of the environment for which this form of recreation should be restricted. The vigor and strength of the Ozark environment along the Current and Jack Fork Rivers overshadow any negative environmental impact of these vehicles. Do not shut off access to God's wonder of the Ozarks by ATVs to citizens who no longer have the physical strength and stamina to enjoy them on their own means.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2625 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 13:21:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am pleased that the NPS is considering public comments for the GMP. Though I agree mostly with Alternative C, a few points should be highlighted:

- Inappropriate visitor use should not be tolerated. The park needs more/better law enforcement officers.
- The Park needs a public liaison that will provide transparent information about actions and processes.

- The Park needs to actively engage in more community based organizations and events.
- Concession permits for canoe rentals need to be evenly distributed among a number of contracts and those contracts need to be open for bid more frequently.
- The Park headquarters should be owned by the Park and built in a more natural setting.
- Illegal use of vehicles should be prosecuted the same as if on private property.
- The Park should engage national concessionaires to determine the feasibility of a "grand lodge" and tourist district.
- The Park needs to be renamed "Ozark Highlands National Park" for branding purposes.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2626    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 13:23:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Definition of Peak Season

I have enjoyed the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for decades during all seasons, and in many ways. To define "peak season" as March 15 through Labor Day does not reflect with any accuracy what actually transpires in terms of use within the riverways. One Park Ranger explained that as early as mid March, floaters begin using the upper Jacks Fork, because that when there is enough water in that section of river to float. I have floated that section of the river, on Saturdays in June. Even at that temperate time of year, the group I float with saw very few other floaters on that section of the river. While I know that people do float there in the spring (I know some who do), to say that use constitutes a "peak" is a stretch of the term.

I now live near the Current River and use it often in the middle of the week and sometimes on weekends through the spring, summer and fall- -occasionally in the winter as well. On most days of the year, use of the Current River and also the Jacks Fork is minimal. To use the term "peak" should be limited to weekends from mid June through mid August, the week of July 4 and Memorial and Labor Day weekends. Spring rains extending into June, flooding and the early start of classes for most Missouri school districts better dictates what is "peak season" in the ONSR than the calendar.

I encourage the National Park Service to not proclaim a "peak season" but rather determine restrictions by projected use bases on bookings of reservations in campgrounds, local motels, and projections by local meteorologists.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2627    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Bill and Russ:

I hope this correspondence finds you both doing well in the new year. I am submitting this letter as my first comment on the newly released draft General Management Plan (GMP). I trust you will give the same due consideration.

I. Regulation of the Waterway Surface

Public use of a particular waterways surface is generally linked to the ownership of the waterways bed. The determination of bed ownership, and corresponding rights over the waterways surface, involves complicated interplays between navigability for title, the equal footing doctrine, public servitudes, prescriptive easements and the property clause.

Specific to the Ozark National Scenic Riverway (ONSR), if waterway segments are determined navigable for title, the State of Missouri is likely vested with title to the bed by virtue of equal footing. Conversely, if waterway segments are determined non-navigable for title, then the bed is likely vested in the federal government by virtue of title acquisition of adjacent land during ONSRs formation.

In those segments navigable for title, I suggest the federal government regulation of the waterway surface violates sovereignty principles not contemplated under the property clause. Additionally, those segments non-navigable for title, remain subject to those restrictions encumbering title. One such encumbrance is a general servitude in favor of public use of the waterway surface. I suggest restricting this general servitude remains outside of the property clause, or at a minimum, is constrained to only those restrictions which are narrowly tailored to correct  
Page 1 of 7

activity injurious to federal property interest.

As the above relates to the draft GMP, the National Park Service (NPS) makes a base assumption that it has the authority to regulate the entire waterway surface within its geographic boundaries. This assumption is made without discussion as to riparian rights, Missouri's

sovereignty and constitutional constraints of federal jurisdiction. For that reason, I respectfully request that the NPS address the following:

" Identify those waterway segments which are navigable for title;

" In those segments determined navigable for title, please explain NPSs regulatory authority over the waterways surface;

" Identify those areas of the waterways which are non-navigable for title;

" In those segments determined non-navigable for title, please explain NPSs regulatory authority to restrict the general servitude in favor of public access, and;

" Finally, in those segments determined non-navigable for title where regulatory measures are planned, please address the anticipated costs of the public servitudes diminution and future potential takings litigation.

Finally, if after exploring the above comments NPS believes regulatory authority exists, I next ask for specific detailed facts justifying each waterway surface regulatory measure to be implemented. I do not believe the justifications stated in the draft GMP are sufficient to meet the heightened review standard necessitated by the riparian rights in play.

## II. Similar Issues with Land Restrictions.

I further question the propriety of certain road and gravel bar closures due to vested public interests prior to ONSRs ownership. While certain roads, trails, gravel bar crossings and/or gravel bar uses were not in existence prior to ONSR acquisition, several were. This past continuous hostile use predating federal title arguably renders that title subject to the same.

I suggest closures - or regulations restricting use beyond those uses common at title vestiture - of those areas in public use at ONSRs formation will operate as a taking. For that reason, I request that the NPS address the following:

" For those areas subject to closure or restrictions, what efforts were made to evaluate the prior public use and potential prescriptive rights, and;

" Please address the anticipated costs of future takings litigation.

Finally, I again request specific detailed facts justifying each regulatory land measure that restricts these prescriptive interests. I do not believe the justifications stated in the draft GMP are sufficient to meet the heightened review necessitated by the prescriptive rights in play.

## III. Sacrifice of the Recreational Purpose

Recreational use was a material consideration during ONSRs creation. The initial proposal for the establishment of an Ozark National Monument was defeated due to concerns it went too

Page 2 of 7

far in restricting recreational use. Subsequently, a compromise was reached in a proposal to create the Ozark Scenic Riverways.

It the initial report by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the committee noted the geographic location of the riverways lends itself to the creation of a federal recreation area. The committee emphasized the importance of creating Federal recreational areas through establishing the Ozark Scenic Riverways. And, the then secretary of the interior, Stewart L. Udall, wrote in correspondence to the committee that he wanted to make clear that recreation is a purpose of the proposal to create the Ozark Scenic Riverways.

The final bill creating the ONSR reflects this compromise. Specifically the stated purpose of the ONSR follows:

For the purpose of conservation and interpreting unique scenic and other natural values and objects of historic interest, including preservation of portions of the Current River and the Jacks Fork River in Missouri as free flowing streams, preservation of springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources thereof by the people of the United States. . .

Finally, in creating the ONSR, the drafters noted the Secretarys authority for conservation and management of natural resources could be utilized only to the extent it furthers ONSRs stated purposes. 16 U.S.C. 460m-5 Again, one such purpose is recreation.

The congressional intent is clear that recreational use stood on equal footing with the remaining stated purposes. However, this footing has continually eroded since ONSRs formation I request that the NPS address the following:

" Why is recreational use subordinated junior to conservation and preservation?

Examples of this subordination are found in multiple ONSR park policy statements, as follows:

" Provide the widest range and highest quality of recreational activities which are consistent with the purpose of the Riverways and which can be accommodated without undue impact. 1989 River Use Management Plan (emphasis added).

" Conditioning recreational use to only those [opportunities] consistent with the preservation of the park units resources. GMP October 2013 draft, pg. 12

" If a conflict occurs between visitor use and protection of resources, the intent of Congress is to favor resource protection. GMP October 2013 draft, pg. 18.

" In making these policy statements, what consideration was given of 16 U.S.C. 1a-1 directive that requires authority to be exercised so as to prevent degradation of the values and purposes [e.g. recreational use] for which a park has been created. As to the specific proposed regulation of recreational uses, I ask you to address the following:

Page 3 of 7

" What are the overriding governmental interest supporting the following restrictions/eliminations of recreational use:

" banning vehicular traffic on non-designated gravelbars;

" banning motorized watercraft on the Riverways through permanent and seasonal closures;

" implementing caps for the number of users undertaking certain recreational activities, e.g. watercraft, camper camping, etc. . . ;

" closing 55 miles of vehicular road and trails;

" closing approximately 20 unidentified river access points;

" closing 65 miles of equestrian trails;

" implementing a permit system for equestrian users;

" developing potential permit systems for watercraft users, and

" imposing new horsepower restrictions below Big Springs.

" What alternatives were considered by the ONSR for protecting these interests, and why were these alternatives not chosen?

" Are there any more narrowly tailored alternatives for protecting these interests, and if so, why were these alternatives not chosen?

" How do these restrictions further ONSRs recreational purpose?

" How do these restrictions degrade the recreational purpose, and is such degradation permissible under 16 U.S.C. 1a-1?

#### IV. Waterway Restrictions

The draft GMP proposes three waterway zones: mixed use, seasonal mixed use and nonmotorized.

The later two zones limit motorized watercraft use only. I ask for the NPS to comment on the following:

" What are the overriding governmental interests necessitating motorized watercraft elimination in certain areas of the waterways?

" If that interest was to create differing user experiences?

" What considerations, if any, were given to the river levels seasonal fluctuations preventing motorized watercraft?

" What considerations, if any, were given to differing volumes of motorized watercraft during seasonal weather changes?

" If seasonal weather and river level fluctuations were considered, why were they determined insufficient to adequately create differing user experiences?

" How does eliminating motorized watercraft further ONSRs recreational purpose?

" How does eliminating motorized watercraft degrade the recreational purpose, and is such degradation permissible under 16 U.S.C. 1a-1?

" Is the elimination of motorized watercraft in violation of the general servitude in favor of public use? If so, what are the anticipated takings cost.

" Is the elimination of motorized watercraft in violation of prescriptive rights predating ONSRs title? If so, what are the anticipated takings cost.  
I suggest eliminating motorized watercraft is unnecessary, overbroad, and outside of regulatory authority. The NPS should shift its focus to provide users information concerning the best  
Page 4 of 7

times and locations to obtain their desired experience.

#### V. Land Based Restrictions

The draft GMP land based management zones are separated into four categories: Developed, Resource-based recreation; Natural, and; Primitive. I ask for the NPS to address the following:

" What are the overriding governmental interests that supports 72% ntural land zoning?

" How is that interest furthered through limiting recreation to only those lowimpact uses where evidence of human use would be limited

" How does this zoning concept further ONSRs recreational purpose?

" How do these restrictions degrade the recreational purpose, and is such degradation permissible under 16 U.S.C. 1a-1?

" What are the overriding governmental interests that supports 16.4% pimitive land zoning?

" How does this zoning concept further ONSRs recreational purpose?

" How do these restrictions degrade the recreational purpose, and is such degradation permissible under 16 U.S.C. 1a-1?

If zoning is utilized, I suggest the zone consistent with all stated purposes is Resources-based recreation. With modifications to allow amenities which are minimally detractive from aesthetic values, the Resource-based recreation concept can properly balance recreational use with conservation and resource preservation. Has this been considered by the NPS? If so, and if a determination was made that conservation and resource preservation could not be accommodated within Resource-based recreation zones, please provide the reasons said conclusion was reached.

#### VI Visitor Use Management

To address perceived congestion, the draft GMP implements Visitor Experience Indicators and Standards. The NPS states these standards are an attempt to limit excessive users, or disruptive uses, inconsistent with the desired river zone. As it relates to the standards, I ask the NPS to address the following:

" Why are the watercraft caps based on historic watercraft users instead of capacity?

" What reasons support your decision to exclude tubes from the definition of watercraft?

" The 6 camper restriction is ambiguous. Please provide clarification as to its intended meaning?

" In implementing designated gravel bar campsites, did the NPS conduct studies to compare congestion on holiday vs. non-holiday weekends?

" If congestion is not present on non-holiday weekends, did the NPS consider more narrowly tailored management approaches to correct the specific holiday congestion in lieu of a blanket management strategy?

" If a narrowly tailored solution was considered, please advise what solutions were considered, and why the same were rejected.

" Please explain why the disorderly conduct standard is not river segment specific.

Page 5 of 7

As the same relates to corrective measures, I ask the NPS to address the following:

" Did the NPS consider that the stated corrective measures may prevent future management discretion to consider changing uses and recreational technology?

" If disruptive behavior problems occur in specific river segments, does the NPS intend to implement corrective measures throughout the entire riverways, even non-problem areas?

" Please explain the logic of requiring quieter boats as a corrective measure for excessive watercraft users.

" This corrective measure has nothing to do with overcrowding, the stated purpose for implementing the standards.

" Please provide greater detail to the potential water craft permit system

While regulating by numbers is logical to counter congestion, it is illogical to regulate disruptive uses. In so far as the visitor standards purpose is to regulate disruptive uses, planning by numbers should be abandoned. Rather the NPS should implement a management strategy that squarely addresses the perceived problem.

#### VII Primary Objective and Favored Use

The preferred alternatives seeks to convert the vast majority of the park to a natural area where evidence of human use is minimal. Similarly, the favored user experience is the ability to observe native wildlife, explore a cave, or ponder the size of a spring flow in solitude.

While the concept of a natural area may be desired by some, others favor recreation based improvements and amenities. Additionally, while pondering the size of a spring flow in solitude is an important user experience, equally important are those social experiences realized between friends and family.

No one use should predominate to the exclusion of another use, and policy formulated to accomplish the same is unnecessary. Seasonal river conditions provide both experiences. Social recreational uses predominately occur on summer weekends, the avid spring ponderers will find solitude during the week, winter, spring and fall.

#### VIII. Horsepower Restrictions

I commend the NPS for recognizing the need for larger horsepower motors to safely navigate jon boats with family sized loads. At present, the 60/40hp motors minimally accommodate the same.

That stated, why are horsepower restrictions necessary? If the intended purpose is to reduce excessive speeds, why not implement speed limits? If the intended purpose is to control wake, why not implement wake restrictions or boat weight restrictions?

Whatever the claimed justifications for limiting horsepower, I ask the NPS to consider if an alternative narrowly tailored regulatory measure exists to accomplish the desire objective.

Page 6 of 7

#### IX. Closure

I appreciate your time in reviewing over and considering my first comment. I anticipate submitting additional comments as time permits.

As always, if I can be of any assistance in the process moving forward, I welcome the same.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2628    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 13:28:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Motorboat Use

The Current River is a navigable by motor powered boats. People who invest in these boats are careful in protecting their investments. They are alert, aware of their surroundings and enjoy the recreation their boats allow them. They also are respectful of others who enjoy the rivers through other means. However, I have witnessed boater being treated rudely verbally and been given obscene gestures by non-boating people.

Boaters don't hesitate to come to the rescue of floaters in dangerous situations, floaters who are in situations that put their lives at risk and floaters who are experiencing medical emergencies. Boaters pick up trash and other debris when canoes or other floats are turned over. Boater help collect return supplies to floaters and help them get back on track with their form of enjoying the river. Boaters take panicked floaters who find that the river is not for them back to their camps, motels or cars. Boaters clean up gravel bars after other floaters leave their trash. Boaters pick up trash in the river that has been released by other floaters. Boaters love, respect and take care of the rivers. Why do boaters do all these things for strangers? That is what decent people do.

Also, law enforcement officers for the National Park Service are rarely around to do these things. They are on stakeouts, watching from a distance where they are not visible to the floaters. This lack of visibility of law enforcement tends to lower the moral and sensible behaviors of people who are drinking alcohol and are in a situation that has often been deadly. When I asked high school students if they behaved the same when the teacher was out of the room as they do when the teacher is in the room, they said no- -there is a difference in behavior when supervision is present and in plain sight. Law enforcement officers for the National Park Service need to be in their boats, floating with the people- -not hiding.

Most boaters do not want to be in the way of floaters, and they don't want to give up access to the areas of the river that other floaters don't use. Most boaters go to a section of the river with their families and stay there until floating

traffic passes through. Many boaters choose to use the river south of Van Buren, where floating in other means is less popular or desired.

If floaters in canoes, rafts or tubs are concerned about boater behaviors, perhaps having a visible law enforcement presence on the river would ease their fears or concerns. Perhaps the few boaters who are rude would be more incline to slow down, idle through floaters and ease the fears of those who are afraid of the river if a stronger law enforcement presence were visible.

Don't change the horsepower regulations for boaters- -more horsepower has been a factor that has saved lives. Don't change where the boaters can go- -they save people, clean up the river and take care of the river environment. If boater behavior is bad, perhaps law enforcement should be visible.

I understand that some believe that motorboats have a negative effect on the river. If you compare the river where tubes and canoes are heavy float areas with the segments where mainly boats travel, you will see that the banks with less tube and canoe use are lush, fishing is vibrant and natural animal life is abundant. The impact of boats on the river ecology is nothing compared to the floods that the river sustains.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2629    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 13:30:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep our rivers and Ozark Scenic National Riverways as protected and pristine as possible. I support Management Plan A. I am a frequent visitor to the rivers and enjoy canoeing and inner tubing.

Thanks,

Gloria Corley

Retired School Counselor

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2630    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 13:34:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am strongly opposed to alternatives A, B, and C, because all the proposals call for an increased restrictions on motor boat uses that would severely handicap gigging and trapping on these rivers. I'm also against them because A, B, and C has plans to eliminate several miles of roads, trails and access to the river ways. This would only be a handicap to the local people for recreation.

I would also like to comment on the Wilderness Area Designation. Dent County has plenty of wilderness areas set aside without setting aside any more. To develop this area just so a few city people can get away from the crowds, would be a slap in the face to the local people that live and rely on this area.

To sum it all up I would like to say that it's obvious that the park service has totally ignored local input and as far as the alternates A, B, or C, I think that the no action alternate is what needs to stay in place.

When I and fellow commissioners talked to Bill Black, he said that the alternate they picked could be tweaked. My feelings on this, let's don't pick an alternative until we have it tweaked to what it needs to say.

We need rules and regulations however when you're not enforcing what's already in place what good do new regulations do.

Sincerely,

Gary Larson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2631    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 13:36:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the attention given to and consideration for mountain biking and other trail uses within the General Management Plan, and urge you to give increased consideration for mountain biking in this and future plans. I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways. I urge you to allow mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in this and future plans, wherever possible and appropriate.

Well-designed mountain bike trails are sustainable and do not have adverse environmental impacts when properly constructed in the right locations. In fact, their environmental impact is often far lower than other trail options- -for instance, equestrian trails.

I feel that the current situation, with mountain biking disallowed on all existing trails and bicycling on area roads discouraged by the Scenic Riverways web page, does not allow visitors the full range of recreation options that at normally available at similar state and national parks across the nation. I am from Northwest Arkansas, and we often would travel to Devil's Den State Park to ride. Allowing substantial mountain bike access in areas where it is appropriate would be a very important improvement in this area.

Missouri has a large and active mountain biking population that will very much use and appreciate these trails and access to this beautiful area, if it is provided.

I encourage you to involve bicycling and mountain biking groups when making decisions about trail access in the Scenic Riverways area.

Thanks,

Chris Oxford

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2632	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 13:37:33				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I come to missouri several times a year to enjoy the rivers and trail ride. I think it is very important to protect what you have. I have to say that I would leave the rules just as they are. I would not want to see anything changed. Thank You, Darlene Viall				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2633	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 13:38:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I was raised on the river my whole life boating, camping, floating, ect. I, in no way, agree with closing if off. We are not hurting the environment.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2634	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 13:42:07				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Ozark National Scenic Riverways 404 Watercress Dr. P.O. Box 490 Van Buren, MO 63965				

---

RE: Comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan (GMP)

Dear Superintendent Black:

My dad introduced me to the rivers and natural areas of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways when I was a kid, and our family used to visit the Jack's Fork and Current River to canoe, kayak, hike, and camp frequently. Now, as an adult, these outdoor activities are a passion of mine, and fuel my concern for the area where my appreciation and respect for natural spaces began.

The Riverways' enabling act has three stated purposes: preservation, conservation, and recreation. Preservation and conservation must come first to ensure that recreation opportunities in the future occur in the same beautiful environment that we enjoy today. The National Park System has a responsibility to maintain the Ozark Riverways in their original state and protect them from harm. Under the current management plan, those objectives are unmet. Unregulated trails and roads have created erosion and other damages to the surrounding environment. Heavy equestrian activity, motorized boating, and overcrowding have led to contamination and declining water quality to the point that rivers are sometimes unsafe for recreation.



In addition, powerboats and vehicle access create noise pollution that affects the recreation experience for others. Some of these activities have even created safety concerns. Powerboaters often behave recklessly and endanger non-motorized boaters. Large, rowdy crowds around gravel bars and in the parks have made me feel unsafe at times. The Riverways belong to the public. Behavior by some should not be allowed to negatively affect the safety or recreation experience of others.

For these reasons, I prefer plan A as outlined in the Draft General Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement. Distribution of resources in the General Management Plan must put emphasis on preservation and restoration of the area first, so there is still a beautiful space for recreation now and in the future.

The Ozark Riverways have stakeholders outside of the local population. One source stated that the Jack's Fork and Current River attracts approximately 1.5 million visitors each year. A 2011 study estimated visitor spending at more than \$55 million with nearly 90 percent of spending from non-local visitors. Outside visitors contribute heavily to the Ozark economy and are stakeholders in this issue. These stakeholders have a right to share their opinion and those opinions should be considered alongside the input of the local population in the creation of the new GMP.

Yours truly,

Allison Burke  
Leawood, KS

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2635	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 13:42:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Public Comment for Ozark National Scenic Riverways Wilderness Designation				

On January 20, 2014, I traveled to Missouri from Indiana to observe both the area suggested for wilderness designation and the public hearing and comment process. During my visit, I was astonished by how beautiful the proposed wilderness designation area is. Never before had I seen, with my own eyes, water as crystal clear as the water in the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers. As a result of my visit I am submitting this comment, which proposes an adoption of a mixture of Alternatives A and B (hereinafter referred to as Alternative B )

As a resident of Indiana since birth I have lived by either the Ohio River or the White River my entire life. I speak from personal experience when I say I know what happens when rivers are not adequately protected. It is because of the current state of my local rivers, and my desire to visit the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers again, that I am writing this comment.

All Alternatives cover thirty-four topics (not including the concept topic). Of those thirty-four topics, Alternatives A and B propose the same action for fifteen topics. For the remaining topics, Alternative B proposes a mixture of Alternatives A and B. Specific topics addressed in this comment are: (1) zoning, (2) concession floating, (3) hiking trails, (4) horse riding and camping, (5) gravel bar access, (6) primitive camping, (7) visitor services and facilities, (8) interpretation and education, (9) natural resource management, (10) cultural resource management, (11) wilderness, and (12) park operations. Alternative B considers both the local desire to use the wilderness area for recreational purposes as well as the need to minimize human impact on the area. For these reasons, Alternative B consists of:

(1) Zoning:

Alternative B incorporates both Alternative A and Bs land-based zoning:

" Developed: 2.8%

Resource-based recreation: 8.8%

Natural: 61.6%

Primitive: 26.8%

ut includes only Alternative As river-based zoning:

" Mixed-use river: 36%

Seasonal mixed-use river: 13%

Non-motorized river: 51%

This mixture allows visitors to have both the opportunity to float secluded stretches of the river away from the sights and sounds of motorized vessels while still allowing for a manageable mix of land recreational activities. This helps visitors discover both the natural and cultural resource-based opportunities available. I believe this mixture of Alternatives balances the local want for recreational activities while minimizing damage to the surrounding area. Because Alternative B wholly adopts Alternative As river-based zoning, Alternative B also adopts Alternative As regulation prohibiting the use of motor vehicles rated higher than 40 horsepower.

(2) Concession Floating:

Alternative B wholly adopts Alternative As Concession Floating in that total designated access points would decrease.

(3) Hiking Trails:

Alternative B adopts Alternative Bs proposal providing 10 miles of primitive zone hiking trails as well as developing access to some discovery sites.

(4) Horse Riding and Camping:

Because the impact of horse riding and camping has proved to be particularly detrimental to the riverways, Alternative B adopts Alternative As approach to horse riding and camping.

(5) With regard to gravel bar access, (6) primitive camping, and (7) visitor services and facilities, vehicular access to ALL gravel bars would be eliminated, roads to primitive campsites would be removed, and all illegally developed trails would be closed.

Alternative B mostly adopts Alternative Bs approach to (8) interpretation and education, (9) natural resource management, and (10) cultural resource management. This approach not only enhances visitor awareness of cultural connections to the area but also allows for greater management of the area to protect and preserve archeological resources, historical structures, and cultural landscapes. This approach also reinstates the oral history program as well as enhances the archives collection program. Such a hands on approach from management would not only help keep a close eye on the area but also strive to educate more people on the unique history of the surrounding area.

Lastly, Alternative B , like Alternative B, designates 3,430 acres of wilderness (topic 11), but adopts Alternative As approach to park operations (topic 12). This way, the largest amount of acres would be designated, but three multi-operational facilities for the enhanced management districts, along with four new housing duplex units (for additional need for seasonal or term staff) would also be constructed.

Alternative B utilizes the best parts of Alternative A and B in that it protects the riverways to the highest degree while allowing for the most managed and protected access to the land. This encourages people to enjoy the space while also providing more educational and management opportunities to ensure that peoples interactions remain low impact. It is for this reason that I encourage the National Park Service to adopt Alternative B

Very respectfully,  
Hannah Belleau

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2636	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 13:44:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello,				

As a frequent user of the Ozark national scenic riverways, I am personally in line with Alternative A, however, that is probably the least unreasonable to the folks already established in the area, so I am in full support of Alternative Plan B and wish the NPS the best of luck in getting this alternative plan implemented. Thank you for your time.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2637	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 13:47:51				

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To NPS;

I am in favor of Alternative A of the Management Plan for The Ozark Waterways. The Current and Jack's Fork rivers are national treasures. They are one of a kind natural wonders that need to be preserved for now and the future. These rivers need to be kept in their natural and pristine conditions. This is not now happening. Overuse by horse, four wheel drive vehicles, and motorized boats are wrecking the fragile ecosystem. To insure the area ecology is not further degraded these uses need to be curtailed. Alternative A is way to keep the Ozark National Scenic Waterways in the natural condition that was intended when it was first established. Thanks for considering my views.

Steven King

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2638 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 13:48:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I was very disappointed in the fact that all of the meetings you had, nobody was allowed to speak, except for the St. Louis meeting. It's pretty clear your concerns for the local people aren't that great.

I don't feel there is any need for the new regulations, you just need to enforce those already in place.

My family and I run out-board jets on the Current River every weekend and last year I didn't see any park service officials enforcing what is already in place.

I grew up on the upper Current River camping every weekend. It would be a shame to not be able to use the lower part of the river anymore. To put more restrictions would be a handicap for our family.

To sum it all up, I support the no-action plan.

Sincerely,

Jacob Sanders

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2639 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 13:54:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thirty-five years ago I was offered a position as a biologist in Missouri. The first thing I did after landing in St. Louis on my job interview was to drive to the Current River. Once I was convinced that it was as wonderful as I had been told, everything else fell into place. I have since been blessed with the responsibility of studying the ecology of this unique ecological treasure. Since my arrival I have had the pleasure of spending considerable time as a scientist, an angler, and as a father, on family camping trips on the Jacks Fork and Current rivers. It is certainly a jewel, the most unique and beautiful river area in Missouri. Unfortunately, it is the only one left in Missouri. It is also a national treasure. Whether appreciated or not, the Riverways belong to all Americans, and the National Park Service has the responsibility of protecting its basic natural features.

Opinions differ greatly on the present condition and future use of the Riverways. However the conclusions from reputable scientists are consistent. All long-term scientific studies conclude the Riverways are in trouble from numerous causes. Stream habitat destruction and water quality degradation lead the list of problems. The proposed management plan actively addresses these problems. Either Plan A or Plan B will address the situation of unauthorized access (increasing runoff and erosion) and unbridled horse access, limiting water quality problems. The NPS needs the support of all Missouri citizens, including those local citizens, who can see the long-term benefits of a pristine Ozark National Scenic Riverways - for our economy as well as our grandchildren.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2640 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 13:55:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service,

I would like to submit the following comments in the hope that they will help you in your decision making process for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I am submitting these comments as a citizen and a life-long resident of Missouri. I am also the Clean Water Program Director at the Missouri Coalition for the Environment and we will be submitting organizational comments as well.

I have spent many of my best days on Ozark Rivers and streams. I feel very blessed to live in an area that offers so many lovely waters for floating and dramatic natural landscapes for outdoor enjoyment. The rivers of Missouri are incredibly valuable, and will only become more so in the coming years which will be fraught with water shortages and extreme drought in many many parts of the country. We are one of the few places in the country with a serious clean water factory in the form of the Ozarks. This is why I think that the NPS should extend the scope of planning further out into the watershed and the groundwater source zones for the Current River. The park service has the opportunity to create a stewardship economy and build community relationships by bringing together watershed stakeholders and all of the public and private conservation interests in the watershed. There needs to be a concerted effort to restore watershed function holistically, especially in terms of the forests, which must be protected and increased to continue to restore and preserve the health of the Current River. Bringing together stakeholders to have a bigger discussion about watershed based goals is the key to protecting the ONSR. Anyone can see that there is great potential to increase the economic utilization of the natural beauty and quality of the area by investing in the natural beauty and quality of the area. I believe that the NPS is well situated to host good watershed discussions and a coalition of partners could commit to certain stewardship principles and set some goals to make the area even better. With the National Forests, Pioneer Forest, MDC, MDNR, and many others invested in serious conservation in the watershed, it seems like there ought to be a watershed plan to guide an overall strategy and find a path forward that will make sure this resource is truly protected as a river system and not falsely protected by a simple and arbitrary park boundary.

I believe in fostering native ecosystems wherever possible, so I am opposed to the introduction of non-native species, especially when they may be responsible for significant impacts to native species that are threatened or endangered. I understand that both elk and trout have been introduced to the watershed, and that in both cases there may be serious repercussions to the native ecosystem and overall river health. The Current River is a smallmouth river, trout are not native to this ecosystem and the impact they may be having on species such as the Hellbender may not be understood well enough to justify the risk of having them stocked in the Current River. The NPS should protect endangered species by asking the Missouri Department of Conservation to stop this practice until they can prove conclusively that the trout are not a threat to the Hellbenders. According to the 2012 Fish and Wildlife Service's April 2012 Recovery Outline for the Ozark Hellbender this must be done to protect this species.

When it comes to Elk, and Horses for that matter, I am not inherently opposed to having non-native large mammals in the watershed, but their impacts must be monitored, moderated and mitigated. I do not think it is good for the watershed to convert any forested landscape to a non-native grassland/grazing area to foster a non-native species. Furthermore this should never happen in a sensitive riparian zone or alluvial floodplain, at least not if we want to protect and preserve the river. I believe that the gravel mining in the river, which is known to be very detrimental to the ecosystem, is being fostered by inappropriate land management. These land mismanagement practices are in turn leading to erosion, as is almost always the case, and this is a cycle that must be broken to protect the river.

Horse trails and usage should follow a long-term strategy for sustainable equestrian recreation in the ONSR, this should be developed in partnership with local and regional stakeholders and conservation interests. There should also be an effort to clean up the horse waste at least below the bankfull height of the river, at least within the park, if not more broadly throughout the watershed. If there were a small horse fee, plus some sort of federal contribution, it is easy to see the potential for creating a few seasonal jobs cleaning up the waste and potentially using the composted waste as a beneficial soil amendment in areas that have lost all topsoil from historic (or recent) logging and land mismanagement. This seems like a win-win-win and I cant understand why it hasnt happened yet? I have experienced the Jacks Fork during and after a big weekend of trail riding, and I was absolutely disgusted by the amount of horse waste on literally all of the gravel bars. We had lunch late in the afternoon, we had continued down the river for miles looking for a clean spot to eat, finally we gave up and tried to cope with the flies and the smell. I couldnt help but be grossed out by the thought that the fly that had just landed on my sandwich, was only a moment before standing and gorging himself on horse shit. This is totally unacceptable on any river, and I would gladly chip in to help clean up the mess, even though I am not responsible for any of it. This was the worst recreational experience I have ever had on any river and I dont understand how it got so far out of hand, and I am unclear on

what the park service has done to mitigate this. Needless to say, I don't visit the Jacks Fork much since that experience, and I don't go to the Current on or after big weekends. I would imagine that the horse riders might be willing to pitch in, the folks in canoes would probably be willing to kick in a little bit to protect their experience, and I'm sure there are some folks from the area who would welcome a job opportunity working to protect water quality in the river. But the size of the trail rides needs to be limited and some kind of strategy to avoid this disgusting situation through planning is in order.

I feel like boat motor horsepower limitations on the river have come in direct conflict with the whole 60/40 jet boat crowd in way that has already caused, and will continue to cause great rifts between the local community and the National Park Service. There is an entire branch of the local economy based on this activity, and the park service has neither enforced the existing horsepower limitations nor changed the law to allow these boats. This must be resolved, and unless there is a strong connection to ecosystem degradation, I would say that the boats should be allowed with specific regulations on boater stewardship of the resource and geared toward avoiding conflicts with other activities. In the end the community is a big part of the watershed, and with good relationships the NPS could truly protect the Current River. By allowing issues that may not be that important in the big picture come between the NPS and the community, we miss out on the opportunity to cooperate towards a better, more sustainable river overall.

Illegal access points and roads in the park connecting to the river should be evaluated based on impacts to the riparian zone, then these impacts should be published so that everyone can see and discuss why specific access points are problematic. Projects should be undertaken to restore the impact areas and there should be a discussion about alternate access for local residents looking to avoid the crowds that flood the park during peak season. I think it would be a good practice to focus on the stretches of road closest to the river or cutting across tributary flows, and focus on getting these roads in sensitive areas removed. More important than these access points, is the occurrence of roads crossing tributaries in the park and the watershed. Low-water crossings and other types of road crossings can be very detrimental to the migration of species up and downstream, cutting off some species from key reproductive zones. There should be a concerted effort to analyze these impacts and work with partners to defragment the watershed ecosystem.

There needs to be a better way to manage canoes, tubes, and kayaks on the river. If there are quotas in place, it is hard to tell. Just as much as tons of horses can ruin a day on the river, so can the massive numbers of floaters. Floaters may also be a significant source of bacteria in the river, and the rowdy drunken behavior is something that should not be allowed. I would like to see the park service put more effort into reigning in the concessioners gone wild, and develop new quotas to account for all of the floatation devices being deployed on the river.

I have witnessed a surprisingly aggressive effort to catch people using marijuana on or around the river and I think this is a HUGE WASTE OF TIME AND TAXPAYER DOLLARS. I do not support my tax dollars going to enforce laws that are barbaric, ruin lives, and restrict personal choice when it has no effect on others. On the same day that I couldn't find a gravel bar to have lunch on, I saw an officer hiding in the bushes of a bend in the river, just waiting to catch someone smoking pot. This was a perfect example to me of why people generally do not trust the government - obvious problems are ignored, while non-issues see excessive enforcement. The NPS needs to get its priorities straight and focus on managing the use of the river and improving the resource, not throwing people innocent of harming others or the resource, in jail. Hopefully these laws will be changed soon anyways, and the NPS won't be obligated to enforce them. But the NPS is obligated to enforce a lot of laws that apparently aren't, so I have a hard time understanding why there seems to be such a priority on catching people smoking pot. With such limited resources and so many real issues in the park, it seems like there would be a lot of ways that same allocation of park management resources could go towards dealing with real issues not hurting tax paying citizens.

I don't understand which version of the gravel bar camping is the final version, but I don't think there should be limitations for those approaching by boat, canoe, kayak or raft. I can see how vehicular access should be limited, I have had the experience of people showing up on a gravel bar I was camping on, late at night with lots of lights and trucks and ORVs. It was not a great experience and I think that it makes sense to limit this user conflict by designating certain gravel bars as vehicle friendly and putting a sign so canoe campers can know where to avoid. Trying to completely ban access seems like another rule that will be nearly impossible to enforce, so it won't be.

In general the plan published by the NPS is very long, and appears to largely be a sort of current version of some

kind of boiler plate document. It is mostly unreadable, it doesn't do a good job of summarizing the information, and much of it seems like government fluff than actual salient information on the river and the justification on the decisions being made. I have noted numerous errors in the plan, both big and small and I have to wonder if it was reviewed by the NPS or other agencies like the USFWS, before it was released. The most glaring error I found was that the Ozark Hellbender is not listed as an endangered species. This is an astounding failure to document one of the most important reasons to improve management of the park. The plan largely ignores the rest of the watershed and it seems like much of the plan may have been written by someone hundreds of miles away in Denver. I don't know if all park national park plans look this muddled and are so fraught with errors, but there needs to be a very intensive review, and re-release of this document. There needs to be about 150 less pages and 150% more information on the actual watershed.

Thank you for your time,

Lorin Crandall

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2641    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 13:56:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I just found out that there is some consideration to opening the Ozark Scenic Waterways Area to mountain bikers. I support this fully. Most mountain bikeers are very responsible people and this is the kind of crowd you want to use these areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2642    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 14:00:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I love Missouri Rivers, especially the Current and Jacks Fork. They are a source of pride and beauty for our entire state. Please ensure that it is protected to the fullest and choose option A and designate Big Spring as Wilderness Area. We must all make sacrifices in order to protect the things that we love.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2643    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 14:01:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am pleased with the attention and consideration given to mountain biking within the General Management Plan, and urge you to give increased emphasis to this subject in your future plans. I am opposed to the no-action option, which will continue to ban mountain biking on all trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Instead, I urge you to permit mountain biking on trails within the Scenic Riverways in this and future plans, wherever possible and appropriate.

Well-designed cross-country mountain bike trails are sustainable and do not have adverse environmental impacts when properly constructed. The environmental impact of mountain biking is often far lower than that of other trail use options, such as, for instance, equestrian use.

I strongly feel that the current situation, with mountain biking prohibited on all existing trails and bicycling on area roads discouraged by the Scenic Riverways web page, does not allow visitors the full range of recreation options that are normally available at similar state and national parks across the nation. Allowing mountain bike access in areas where it is appropriate would be a very important improvement in this area.

Missouri and the Midwest region has a large and active mountain biking population that will certainly use and appreciate these trails and access to this beautiful area, if it is provided. I encourage you to involve bicycling and mountain biking groups when making decisions about trail access in the Scenic Riverways area.

In addition, I would like to emphasize the positive economic impact that mountain biking oriented tourism would bring to the Scenic Riverways area, while making negligible environmental impacts, if any. For example, this study published in the Journal of Leisure Research applied the travel cost method to a popular mountain biking destination:

<http://trove.nla.gov.au/work/56688066?q&versionId=69670962>

Other economic studies have found positive benefits to mountain biking, and cycling in general, which, I again emphasize, has very little environmental impacts:

<http://www.linfield.edu/linfield-news/photo-gallery-2/mountain-biking-events/comment-page-1/>

<http://www.dot.state.mn.us/research/TRS/2013/TRS1309.pdf>

These economic benefit will accrue to the surrounding communities and increase visits to the Scenic Riverways if mountain biking access is permitted to trails where appropriate. Missouri and the Midwest region has active volunteer groups involved in trail building and maintenance, such as Gateway Off-Road Cyclists and the Ozark Trail Association in the Saint Louis area. It is likely that much of the trail building and maintenance in the Scenic Riverways would be undertaken by volunteers in cooperation with the NPS and other stakeholders. I urge you to devote some attention and consideration to the Missouri mountain biking community in addition to other trail users when making decisions regarding this and other National Park Service lands.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2644	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 14:05:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I'm writing as a teacher who has led service trips, adventure canoe trips and other school programs in the ONSR for nearly 25 years. I also own land that has been in our family for over forty years with extensive frontage on the Meramec River in Crawford County. I am familiar with the devastating effects of excessive traffic on the rivers. As someone who could once lead trips to the ONSR without fear of ATV traffic roaring through our campsite or of reckless motor boat traffic, I can testify to sad decline of this treasured place.

I attended the forum at Powder Mill Valley. At the forum, I was accosted by jet boaters who made the preposterous claim that jet boats were necessary to provide safety on the rivers. Given my experience on the Meramec River, I would say that jet boaters pose, if anything, a significant risk to our safety. In any case, as a guide and ACA certified whitewater instructor who routinely provides rescue on rivers, I would say that a competent paddler can reach anyone who needs assistance on these rivers. I encourage you to perceive the claims made by the jet boaters as a disingenuous attempt to cast a selfish recreation as a public service.

I subsequently spoke at the forum at Powder Mill Valley and had a letter published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Wednesday, January 29, 2014. I wrote the following:

"When I spoke to opponents of the management proposals for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways at Powder Valley, they objected in principle to the federal government managing property in their backyard and to any limitations imposed on their access to the river. They did not mention all those elements of federal assistance that they apparently accept freely: interstate highways, national security, rural electrification, just to name a few. And while we all stood to acknowledge those who defended our country in the armed services, there was no consideration given to what we are defending when we defend our country. I imagine we would all include the treasures of our landscape and the rule of law as two items in the list of things worth defending. We routinely impose limits on access in order to protect common areas: no one is proposing elevators and paved paths for wheelchair access to the Grand Canyon for the simple reason that these measures to provide access for all would actually deface the qualities that make the Grand Canyon magnificent in the first place. What makes our country worth defending is that we recognize the value of protecting places like the Ozark National Scenic Riverways from practices that may degrade them, just as we recognize the importance of providing electricity to those who cannot afford to create their own grid. The funds and the policies for both come from a collective greater than one community. This is how government works, and it may cost something."

I ask that you please endorse alternative A for managing the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. We have precious few rivers that are free of motorized traffic. As I wrote in my letter to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, we need our government to protect our natural resources from the degrading effects of excessive traffic and pollution; if we leave management decisions to the whims and excesses of individual appetites, those appetites will destroy what made the ONSR appealing in the first place.

Here's a story you'll never hear from those who celebrate local management:

Before Leo Drey created the LAD Foundation, he was the largest landowner in the area. He began purchasing property in the 50's for as little as \$4 per acre; legend has it he never spent more than \$25 per acre. By the time he finished purchasing land, he owned over 100 square miles, naming it the Pioneer Forest. The story of the foreclosures and so on that enabled this purchase is complicated, but no one will debate the following facts: the land was clear cut in the early part of the century, by the 30's there was no game as a consequence of unregulated hunting, and by the 50's, ten years before the designation of the park, Leo could buy land for a song because what was left was overgrazed by free ranging hogs, cattle and horses. By mid-century, as a consequence of local and corporate management, the land was rendered worthless to all but those sentimentally attached to it and a patient logger with deep pockets.

Opponents of state or federal management might point to the River Des Peres as an example of what happens when city folk control resources, and they'd be right. The difference is we learned something about water management since we paved the River Des Peres, and we still have time to apply what we've learned to the management of the ONSR.

Sincerely,

Michael Dee  
6232 McPherson Avenue  
St. Louis, MO 63130

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2645	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 14:12:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I want to keep access to the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers open to all Americans as it is now. Of course I want to protect the water quality. I am unaware of any research which indicates that has deteriorated. I want the gravel bars to be open to camping and picnicking as it always has been. The property owners along the rivers should be allowed to have access to the river and allowed to farm, log and raise animals as they always have. Trail rides should be allowed as well as canoeing. The use of motorized boats should not be further restricted. The use of motorized vehicles should not be restricted. The use of beaches and sandbars for baptisms should not be outlawed. Hunting and fishing should not be restricted. Landowners should be allowed have camp grounds and motels and B and B's. Residents of this isolated and lovely region should be allowed to have access to the rivers to make a living and hold cultural and religious events as they always have. In my opinion the bait of Federal money is being used in an attempt to grab this regional park and transform it into a National Park and eventually run it as Yellowstone National Park is run. PLEASE DON'T DO THIS. DO NOT IMPLIMENT ANY OF THESE PLANS!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2646	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 14:14:37				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I ask that no new restrictions be placed on the riverways from jacks fork river to Gooseneck on current river. This will cause economic hardships on a local peoples whom have seen depressed employment oppourtunities for the last several years.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2647	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Electronically Submitted to NPS on February 7, 2014

Comments on the Draft General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement

Submitted by Bruce A. Cox, P.O. Box 475, Eminence, MO 65466



Thank you for the the opportunity to comment on the Draft General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). My wife and I live on a farm in the Eminence area with frontage on the Jacks Fork River. We love the beauty of Ozarks and know there is nowhere else we would rather live.

I enjoy floating / canoeing the rivers of the ONSR, camping on gravel bars when I go on overnight floats, riding ATVs and horseback riding which sometimes include riding in the ONSR. A wake of environmental destruction has not followed in the path of these activities. Needless to say, Alternative B will negatively impact the activities many have historically enjoyed in the ONSR.

About 5 years ago, when public comments were sought on the first draft of the ONSR General Management Plan, about 3,000 local residents formally commented. Most of the comments, including my own advocated the No-Action Alternative as their preferred option. It was very disappointing that this voice was not heard as the National Park Service's (NPS's) selected Alternative B as the preferred option. Is it possible that local residents are not considered important stakeholders by the NPS?

#### Negative Impacts of Alternative B

I am opposed to an ONSR management plan that would negatively impact local heritage and culture. It is my concern that Alternative B will do just that. Closing river accesses, designating only certain gravel bars for camping, no use of ATVs in the ONSR, and horseback riding only on designated trails are a few of the restrictions in Alternative B that would negatively impact local heritage.

I am also opposed to a management plan that has great potential to harm the local economies of counties bordering the ONSR. The economic impact analysis presented in Draft General Management Plan failed to analyze the potential economic impacts to local economies for the management alternatives considered. This should be done before final actions are taken. I am particularly concerned for the negative impacts to horse trail ride businesses (Cross Country Trail Ride [CCTR], Big Creek Trail Ride, etc.). Horse trail riding businesses bring in considerable commerce and revenues to counties where they are located. It is no secrete that many counties bordering the ONSR are poor and can ill-afford actions by NPS which would further harm their already fragile economies.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2648	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 14:16:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Mr. Bill Black,				

There is no place on this physical earth that I love more than the hills, hollers, and waters within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (OSNR). It was where I was raised, where I recreate, and where I will always call home. The vast majority of my fondest memories come from times I've spent within the park. It's where I harvested my first spring gobbler, where I caught my first smallmouth bass, and where I took my first canoe trip. At the age of 12 (or 28 for that matter), I thought heaven was a cabin overlooking the Jacks Fork River with a rope swing and a swimming hole below. I do not believe that anyone could possibly care more about the Riverways as what I do.

I believe I look at the ONSR from a unique perspective that not many others can. Growing up, my father was a ranger with the ONSR for over 30 years. That experience gave me an understanding of the challenges that the National Park Service (NPS) faces in managing the Riverways. I've also worked many summers for a canoe rental concessionaire on the upper Current River. I have an understanding of the importance these concessionaires are to the local economies, the tourists who frequent the park, and some of the challenges they face trying to operate. Finally, I'm a register Professional Engineer specializing in water resource issues and designs. I have an understanding of the physical processes that govern the geomorphology that drives the current shape of our beloved rivers.

Now the National Park Service (NPS) has gone through a solicitation process to receive comments from the public to develop a General Management Plan (GMP) for the ONSR. After reviewing their draft plan, I feel compelled to say that I do not support any of the alternatives they have proposed as they are currently constructed. While there might be things within each individual alternative that I could support, the way they have been compartmentalized makes little sense to me. Rather than broadly lumping all of the issues that concern the park into three alternatives

the park should have dealt directly with individual issues and mapped out specific paths forward.

I want to begin to address what the issues facing the ONSR that are closest to my heart. I intend to address those issues with the following in mind:

The "Ozark National Scenic Riverways was created through congressional legislation on August 24, 1964 (by Public Law 88-492) to conserve and interpret the scenic, natural, scientific, ecological, and historic values and resources within the National Riverways, and to provide for public outdoor recreational use and enjoyment of those resources."

So much hinges on this statement, but what does it mean? To me it means the following:

The ONSR was created as a recreational area for all the public to enjoy, specifically for water based recreation (as this park was established because of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers). If any form of recreation begins to harm or impact the resource in an adverse manner, then it should be restricted (or eliminated from) within the park boundaries.

If individuals wish to define the park as something other than this; then the NPS should seek a reauthorization from Congress.

### GEOMORPHOLOGY

I was sorely disappointed to see that the draft GMP did not cover the geomorphology of the Riverways. All that I could find in the document concerning geomorphology is reference to the karst geomorphology that provides the area with so many unique springs. While the karst features are an important aspect of the park and need to be preserved, there is more that should have been covered.

It is impossible for the National Park Service to make educated and informed decisions on what impacts the Riverways, the gravel bars, and the adjacent floodplains without first understanding the geomorphology that drives this system. Historical accounts of the river state that there used to be very few gravel bars within the system and that the channel contained more of a bedrock bottom. I see no evidence that shows the park understands what has caused this change, how it is continuing to change, and how the Riverways should be managed in an environment that is so dynamic. I have my opinions on this; however, they are just opinions. There should be official research done by professional geologists and engineers to study this dynamic process of geomorphology in this region so that they can make informed decisions on how activities (such as canoeing, motor boating, off road vehicle use, etc.) along the river are impacting the resource. If recreational activities are adversely impacting the geomorphologic processes along the Riverways, then the NPS has a legitimate reason to restrict those activities.

### WATER QUALITY

The draft GMP references the importance of water quality for the ONSR. The NPS should strive to have some of the most pristine waters in the nation along the Riverways. Any activities that are detrimental to the water quality within the Riverways should be given a hard look at from the NPS. This area was established as a national park in order to protect the water quality of the rivers and springs located within the park boundaries and the NPS should actively enforce the laws that are already in place to protect this pristine resource.

### WILDLIFE

The ONSR should be strongly concerned about the wildlife that dwells within its boundaries. In the draft GMP there is lots of discussion concerning wildlife, both on the land and in the waters. Going forward, the NPS should promote habitat improvements and restoration of all native species that have historically dwelled in the ONSR. The park should not support the introduction of non-native or invasive species. Any activities that are negatively impacting native wildlife populations should be of great concern to the NPS.

### FLOATING

Without question, canoeing is the chief recreational activity within the ONSR. People flock to the Riverways from all across the nation to float the beautiful Current or Jacks Fork River. I have personally floated the Current River from Baptist camp to Powder Mill and the Jacks Fork River from Bay Creek down to the confluence with the Current. I can't even begin to speculate how many hours I've spent floating down the Riverways in a 17' square-stern canoe.

Some people think that certain sections of the Riverways face many issues from overcrowding of the floaters. From my personal perspective, I think there are times during the summer when the Riverways are "overcrowded" from the canoers, kayakers, rafters, and tubers. I hate to see large crowds of people coming down the river when I choose to spend my precious time down there. However, all people have a right to come recreate on the Riverways. It was preserved for everyone's use. Just because I don't like seeing large crowds of people down there doesn't necessarily mean that those large crowds negatively impact the resource.

Obviously, the more people that are in a natural environment, the more opportunities you have to impact the environment. The park should seek to answer the following questions about this user group:

• How does this user group impact the Riverways?

• At what volume of users does this group begin to impact water quality beyond a safe standard?

• Does this user group negatively impact the geomorphology?

I don't have these specific answers. Sadly, I'm afraid the NPS doesn't either since I could not find them in the GMP. I feel that since this park was designated as a nation recreational area that as many floaters as possible should be allowed to recreate within the boundaries of the park at any given time, until the point where they negatively impact the resource. It's on the park's shoulders to clearly articulate what constitutes a negative impact to the resource from floaters and regulate accordingly.

#### MOTORIZED BOATS

The use of motorized boats within the boundaries of the ONSR is a very popular activity amongst people who live near the Riverways. It is an activity that I enjoy within the park as I specifically love to fish for smallmouth bass out of these vessels. I have many memories involving motorized boats such as gigging my first sucker above the Pulltite Access or trapping with my father below the Welch Spring put-in.

All of the proposed alternatives wish to restrict motorized boats within the boundaries of the ONSR. Specifically, the NPS preferred alternative (Alternative B) seeks to completely eliminate the use of motorized boats on Current River above the Pulltite Access, an area that I enjoy using in a motorized boat. Why does the NPS seek to restrict the use of motorized boats along the Riverways? Is there some sort of evidence or empirical data that shows motorized boats are negatively impacting the resource? With the ONSR being designated as a national recreation area, the park should not seek to restrict activities where there is no evidence that they are impacting the resource. If the park has evidence that motorized boats cause damage to the resource then it should have been specifically and concisely presented in their draft GMP.

The only real justification by the NPS to restrict motorized boats I can find in the draft GMP is the following statement:

The restriction of motorized boats "would help reduce motorboat disturbances to aquatic habitat (such as displaced aquatic vegetation, fish spawning impacts, and petroleum-based water pollution) and motorboat noise disturbance to riparian habitat and wildlife behavior (such as bird nesting and bird communication)."

In all the pages of the draft GMP, I see no data to support this statement made by the NPS. Furthermore, if these are true concerns, how do other Riverways users (canoes, kayakers, hikers, horse riders, etc.) affect them? If the NPS feels so strongly that motorized boats impact the resource in this manner, maybe they should lead the way in not utilizing them for their day-to-day functions within the park. As for myself, I feel that these claims are unfounded and that motorized boats do not impact the environment in a negative manner.

If there is not data that shows motorized boats impact the river, why did the NPS seek to restrict the usage of them? I assume it is because they received comments during the GMP process where individuals voiced opinions opposed to motorized boats within the park. While I don't believe that motorized boats pose any threat to the resource, I feel that boat operators who are impaired by the effects of alcohol pose a threat to the resource and others recreating with it. I would rather suspect that many of these comments come from people who have negative encounters with individuals who are operating motorized boats under the influence of alcohol.

I have personally encountered many individuals operating motorized boats obviously impaired by the effects of

alcohol. This should not be tolerated within the ONSR. These individuals taint the image of all motorized boat users. The NPS has guidelines established in the government's Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) pertaining to the abuse of alcohol while operating a motorized boat within park boundaries (36 CFR - Section 3.10). The NPS should look to enforce the established laws and protect responsible users of motorized boats.

#### RIVER CROSSINGS BY OFF-ROAD & ALL TERRAIN VEHICLES

In my lifetime I believe that I have crossed the upper Current River at every conceivable spot with either a 4-wheel drive truck or an ATV. This is an inappropriate use of the Riverways, and displays great negligence on my part. I believe that these actions negatively impact the resource and should not be allowed within the ONSR. According to the Water Resources Foundation

Report (April 2007 - [http://www.nature.nps.gov/water/planning/foundation\\_reports/Reports/OZARWRFRfinal.pdf](http://www.nature.nps.gov/water/planning/foundation_reports/Reports/OZARWRFRfinal.pdf)) these river crossings within the ONSR are very detrimental to the environment. It states:

"Roads are a great threat to streams because of sediment loading. Heavily used gravel roads can contribute 100 times more sediment than paved or abandoned roads. Dirt and gravel roads within the Ozarks in general are the largest source of sediments to streams, outweighing the combined impacts of pasture erosion, logging, and natural erosion."

I think it is obvious that roads fording the river generate the more impacts than those that are maintained up on the ridges as they provide a direct source for sediment contamination.

Let's look at a specific case on the upper Current River. Many people cross the river at the Flying-W Bluff hole. I frequently hear that this is a "county road." While many people might consider it a "county road" now, I don't think that it has always been considered one. Before the NPS bought the area known as Flying "W," the Weissman family owned and farmed the area. At that point in time, the gravel road that takes you from Highway K down into the area had a gate located on it before you reach the fields that are adjacent to the river. The area was private property and you did not go past the gate without the consent of the Weissman family. Additionally, there would have been a river crossing there below the Flying "W" Bluff before the NPS would have bought the land. This crossing would have been used by the Weissman family to access their neighbors, Carter Riley and family, across the river and vice versa. These families farmed together along the Current River and had a legitimate reason to ford the river in order to help one another. Once the NPS bought these farms, they had the authority and power to control access to this area and the river crossing.

Let's contrast the river crossing at Flying-W to the one at Akers Ferry. Currently there is a ferry boat at Akers that is used to connect Highway K across Current River. Due to insufficient maintenance from the NPS this ferry is often inoperable. As a result people have a legitimate need (and right) to ford the river at this location as it is part of the state highway system. The NPS should seek a solution to have the ferry operated on a more consistent basis (i.e. keeping the area clear of gravel to allow the ferry boat to cross) or some other measures to maintain a balance between traffic needs and environmental concerns.

The only reason that people cross the Current River in off-road vehicles at Flying-W is because of recreation. There is not a legitimate case that would support it as a viable roadway with economic benefit. With evidence that it degrades the environment the NPS should look to enforce laws that are already in place by the State of Missouri. The Missouri Revised Statutes, Chapter 304, Section 304.013 states that:

"No person shall operate an off-road vehicle within any stream or river in this state... All law enforcement officials or peace officers of this state and its political subdivisions or department of conservation agents or department of natural resources park rangers shall enforce the provisions of this subsection within the geographic area of their jurisdiction."

This problem persists due to a lack of leadership within the Park Service's management. They have the authority to make a change without any sort of development of a GMP and choose to do nothing. Past and present managers of the ONSR should be held accountable for not taking action on this front.

#### RIVER ACCESS POINTS

River accesses are an important topic to many individuals. There are many different views on how many access

points there should be along the river and what areas should be access points. In the draft GMP the NPS would seek the following with their preferred alternative (Alternative B):

"Concession dropoff and pickup locations for river users utilizing nonmotorized watercraft would be redistributed to reduce peak-season crowding effects and to protect river resources in response to potential changes in river flow conditions. This would require closure and restoration of about 20 access points and the careful design and opening of 20 new designated access points. Total designated access points would remain constant or decrease."

There are many problems I have with the above statement primarily revolving around its ambiguity. What access points would you look to "decrease" or close? What do you mean by "restoration" of access points? Which 20 access points with the ONSR have been identified for this? Why are you not more specific in your plan and articulate a specific path forward?

It is impossible for individuals to know how you plan to manage the Riverways Access points with the above information. Access points along the Riverways should be built-up to support the recreational needs of the park visitors. By that I do not mean that every access point needs to be paved with concrete or have a boat ramp put in, but they should be accessible and "user-friendly" to the public. It should also be considered that not all floaters wish to do a 15 or 20-mile float trip. Personally, I like to float no more than 3 or 4 miles at a time. For me, floating and fishing go hand-in-hand. I like to spend all day fishing, wading, drifting, and floating a small section of river. If you are looking to have just 20 access points in the whole ONSR then you will be eliminating the vast majority of the short float trips I like to embark on.

Let's look at access points from the perspective of the quality that they should be in. I'll discuss a specific access point, Pulltite Landing. I have spent many Saturday afternoons working at Pulltite Landing loading canoes, kayaks, and rafts for one of the canoe rental concessionaires. That access area is inadequate in size to support the number of watercraft that float into there on a summer afternoon. Due to its small size it is difficult for the various concessionaires to load all the vessels in a non-chaotic manner. If there was a larger access area it would ease the job of the concessionaires and provide a better recreational experience to the visitors of the park.

The NPS could facilitate a larger access gravel bar at that landing. In the 70's and 80's the NPS maintenance staff would pull gravel from the opposite side of the river and bring it over to the existing landing to "build it up." This plan has been abandoned in recent years. Many people feel that any movement of gravel within the river channel negatively impacts the environment. I would contend that in a controlled and limited manner this practice would be a beneficial and cost efficient tool in managing some of the rivers access points without any significant impacts to the environment. The NPS has a responsibility to provide the public with suitable access points on the ONSR and I feel that they are falling short on this matter.

#### HORSES AND TRAIL RIDES

Possibly the second largest user group, behind floaters, in the ONSR are horse riders. Unfortunately due to the expanse of this user group, they have collectively begun to degrade the water quality of the Riverways. The Jacks Fork River between Eminence and its confluence with the Current River has seen the most damage.

The U. S. Geological Survey, in conjunction with the NPS, conducted multiple studies on the Jack River to monitor its water quality. A study completed in 2006 titled the Assessment of Possible Sources of Microbiological Contamination in the Water Column and Streambed Sediment of the Jacks Fork, Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Missouri-Phase III states the following:

"The largest fecal coliform bacteria densities in the water column and streambed sediment generally were detected in samples collected at the three main-stem sites with the most intense cross-country horseback trail-riding activity. Exceedences of the whole-body-contact recreation standard occurred at these sites during trail rides."

"Recreational users (including boaters and swimmers) are not the primary source of fecal coliform bacteria in the Jacks Fork; rather, the presence of fecal coliform bacteria is associated with other animals, of which horses are the primary source. Increases in fecal coliform bacteria densities in the Jacks Fork are associated with cross-country horseback trail-riding events."

What this means is that the NPS has seen clear evidence that a user group is directly impacting the water quality of the Riverways. What has the NPS done in response to this?

Nothing, absolutely nothing...

The NPS has done absolutely nothing to correct this wrong and does not address specific measures in their draft GMP of how they will right this wrong. There is direct evidence that showing fecal coliform levels from horse manure in the Jacks Fork River have been measured at levels unsuitable for humans to be in contact with. Why does the NPS refuse to act on this? You do not have to wait for your GMP to be completed. You could have acted on this in 2006, but you didn't. How is it possible that the management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways can bat a blind eye towards this outrageous offense? The managers of the NPS have been entrusted to protect the resources here in the ONSR but have chose the convenient path to not make hard decisions and neglect their duties. How long will you let this continue?

The solution is rather simple if you would just seek it out. The reason fecal coliform skyrockets during trail rides is because when riders cross the Riverways with their horses they generally stop them to allow the horse to take a drink and when stopped the horses tend to then defecate in the water. To quickly resolve this issue you could do one of the following:

- (a) Eliminate horses crossings along the Riverways
- (b) Require all horses to wear some sort of bag that collects their fecies

Trail riders are a valid user group within the park and deserve to have a presence in the ONSR, but when their form of recreation degrades the resource to a point that it becomes harmful to others then they should be subject to losing some of their privileges. If the NPS continues to do nothing on this issue; then we will continue to see issues with fecal coliform.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. Black, the National Park Service does not need a new General Management Plan to govern the park; the original guidance Congress gave them should still suffice:

"To conserve and interpret the scenic, natural, scientific, ecological, and historic values and resources within the National Riverways, and to provide for public outdoor recreational use and enjoyment of those resources."

I hope that you understand that my critical response to the GMP does not mean I support that the NPS take a "No Action" stance. I think the NPS should take action to preserve this resource. They should develop specific management strategies on how they are going to handle the diverse array of user groups within the boundaries of the ONSR. They shouldn't seek to restrict any who wish to recreate inside the park, unless those users become detrimental to the resource.

I greatly appreciate you taking the time to read through my concerns with the draft General Management Plan and the Riverways as a whole. I would relish an opportunity to further discuss these issues in person or over the phone if you ever felt compelled. My contact information is listed below. You have been entrusted with a great responsibility over the place on this earth that I love above all others and call home. I hope that you live up to that responsibility and do what is right for the Riverways.

Sincerely,

William C. Terry Jr., P.E.  
(573) 247-6036

4977 Lotus Avenue  
Saint Louis, MO 63113

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2649    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 14:18:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Bill Black, Superintendent Ozark National Scenic Riverways 404 Watercress Drive P.O. Box 490 Van Buren, MO 63965

RE: Draft General Management Plan, Ozark National Scenic Riverways

Dear Superintendent Black:

We appreciate this opportunity to comment on the draft General Management Plan for the Ozark Riverways. The L-A-D Foundation owns Pioneer Forest which Leo Drey established in 1951 to demonstrate how to improve forest quality by selecting individual trees for harvest. Much of Pioneer Forest joins the national park, providing a significant and compatible buffer and protecting a large part of the Current River watershed. The foundation also owns nearly 1000 acres of land under NPS scenic easement, including more than 35 miles of riverfront along the Jacks Fork and Current rivers.

The L-A-D Foundation feels that a much improved management plan for ONSR is long overdue, and endorses your Alternative B. Issues of special concern are detailed below. Pioneer Forest LLC is separately organized, and its staff located in Salem is submitting specific comments on your draft General Management Plan as well.

The L-A-D Foundation owns nearly 1000 acres under scenic easement by the National Park Service. These easements, and others on privately-owned land within the park, were acquired with taxpayer money. The intention was to limit further development in order to protect the scenic natural river corridor. The ONSR has only sporadically monitored or enforced these legal protections, and thus has failed to prevent abuse. These easements constitute a public property interest and must be more vigorously and consistently managed.

The 3400-acre backcountry portion of the old Big Spring State Park has been undeveloped ever since it was purchased in the 1920s by the State of Missouri, and then since the 1960s when it was transferred to become part of the ONSR. This wildland resource has been managed for 90 years as a backcountry, providing long-distance hiking opportunities and other outdoor activities. The L-A-D Foundation agrees with citizen conservation and outdoor organizations that this area of the park, along with adjacent lands of the Mark Twain National Forest, should be permanently protected as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System. Such official designation will depend upon an Act of Congress, but the NPS should continue to manage the area as it has, providing a quiet and alternative recreation option for visitors.

Management within wilderness is often misunderstood. One example is the use of prescribed fire to maintain natural communities. In other parks, prescribed fire is successfully conducted without the use of motorized equipment inside wilderness boundaries. Such management for the Big Spring area may be useful to maintain natural landscapes, and we encourage the National Park Service to explore various options for doing so that do not diminish the area's wildland character.

Cultural resources, such as old schools, archaeological sites, buildings, and landscapes should be protected. One natural resource of especially high value is riparian forest. These are greatly diminished in the Ozarks, and opportunities to restore such forests on the Riverways should be taken whenever possible. The park should allow reverting bottomland fields to restore themselves naturally, over time, to riparian forests, rather than reconverting them to open fields or pasture.

The upper Current between Cedar Grove and Akers Ferry is relatively narrow, receives a high level of use, and already includes many points of access. Further development of the Flying W area and a new development directly across from Welch Spring should be placed on hold, in favor of restoring river-based experiences in this section of

the river.

The outstanding resources of the Current River deserve a higher standard of protection, and this plan promises to move the park in that direction. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Greg F. Iffrig, Liaison to the Board  
L-A-D Foundation

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2650    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 14:18:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in support of plan A & B. I have been floating the Current and Jacks Fork for 50 years. I hope that we can put a stop to all illegal roads keeping it as wild as iv always rememberd. I also hope whatever plan is placed into action it is better enforced better than the recent manigment program.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2651    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 14:19:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Electronically Submitted to NPS on February 7, 2014

Comments on the Draft General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement

Submitted by Bruce A. Cox, P.O. Box 475, Eminence, MO 65466

Thank you for the the opportunity to comment on the Draft General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). My wife and I live on a farm in the Eminence area with frontage on the Jacks Fork River. We love the beauty of Ozarks and know there is nowhere else we would rather live.

I enjoy floating / canoeing the rivers of the ONSR, camping on gravel bars when I go on overnight floats, riding ATVs and horseback riding which sometimes include riding in the ONSR. A wake of environmental destruction has not followed in the path of these activities. Needless to say, Alternative B will negatively impact the activities many have historically enjoyed in the ONSR.

About 5 years ago, when public comments were sought on the first draft of the ONSR General Management Plan, about 3,000 local residents formally commented. Most of the comments, including my own advocated the No-Action Alternative as their preferred option. It was very disappointing that this voice was not heard as the National Park Services (NPSs) selected Alternative B as the preferred option. Is it possible that local residents are not considered important stakeholders by the NPS?

Environmental Quality of ONSR

I am an environmental scientist with a Ph.D. in environmental toxicology. Most of my professional career has been spent designing and conducting studies to measure ecosystem health. My doctoral research at Texas A&M University involved determining the fate and effect of petroleum hydrocarbons on marine invertebrates and their habitats. After graduate school, I worked for many years in the private sector where I continued to work in the areas of marine, freshwater and terrestrial environmental quality. Based on my knowledge and professional experience, the ONSR represents a very healthy ecosystem. Species diversity and abundance are high in the ONSR and surrounding public lands. In my professional opinion, current uses of the ONSR are not causing significant environmental harm and I reject the notion that the ONSR is a degrading natural resource which needs fixing given current uses.

Most of the natural resources in the Ozarks moved to an all-time low when vast acres of forest in the region were clear cut in the early 1900s. As the forests resources rebounded over the past 100 years after clear cutting stopped, so did overall terrestrial and water quality. Environmental quality of lands making up the ONSR has continued to improve since the start of the ONSR in the 1960s. This improvement is due mainly because commercial and residential development has not been allowed within ONSR boundaries. In other words, the resource continues to



repair itself mainly by passive management. The main active management applied to Ozark ecosystems relates to continuing terrestrial and water quality protection by Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) and wildlife management (e.g. the building of turkey, deer and river otter populations) by Missouri Department of Conservation (MDC). It should be noted that horseback and ATV riding, and accessing the river in many areas, including camping on gravel bars, were activities occurring during all the years of NPS management. Yet overall environmental quality was not significantly altered by these activities.

Prior to clear-cutting in the early 1900s many creeks and long stretches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers had bedrock bottom. After clear-cutting, considerable gravel eroded into the streams and rivers leaving the gravel bottomed streams we have today. The gravel that is already in the rivers is slowly moving downstream, but it will take years for the streams to return to their pre-clear-cut condition. Today, throughout the Ozarks, there is enough healthy vegetative cover (trees, grasses, etc.) that gravel and soil erosion to our rivers is insignificant even given historic horseback and ATV riding in the ONSR.

Horseback riding is blamed for occasional exceedance of total coliform bacteria standards in the Jacks Fork River. Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) sampled extensively to assess the coliform problem in the Jacks Fork River for about 10 years starting in the 1990s. Reports of those sampling programs are likely on file in at ONSR headquarters. They are also available from MDNR. Over 95% of samples taken did not exceed water quality standard for total coliform. Exceedances of the total coliform standards in place in the 1990s were occasionally found when water samples were taken immediately downstream of areas where horses were actively crossing the Jacks Fork River. Higher coliform levels were also sometimes found near the Eminence wastewater treatment plant outfall. Another area of exceedance was at the mouth of Shawnee Creek. The source of coliform bacteria in Shawnee Creek water is attributable to land use up the creek (beyond the ONSR). Data from these MDNR studies certainly indicate the coliform problem is minor, and not always related to horseback riding.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2652	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 14:20:29
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

Kansas City has a very active Earth riders chapter that is making kc a destination for mountain biking. Missouri has so much to offer the next generation and mountain biking is a great sport to combine a love for the outdoors and physical activity.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2653	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 14:22:04
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** I hope the National Park Service will adopt Alternative A or Alternative B as its management plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I have visited this park many times during the past 30 years for canoeing and camping. During my most recent visits, I was deeply saddened by the degradation of this beautiful area. I hope that with better management it will again become a source of pride for our state and nation.

I appreciate the fact the park is an economic engine in the region. I appreciate the desire of local residents- -and hundreds of thousands of other visitors- -to enjoy these rivers. But if this park is not better managed, and if this beautiful area is not restored and better protected, the economic engine will grind to a halt.

I have visited many other national parks, including the most popular ones. Managers of these parks are dealing with a variety of serious problems, but I left each one with excellent experiences and memories of a beautiful place. I

hope I can say that about the Ozark National Scenic Riverways again soon.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2654    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 14:24:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Electronically Submitted to NPS on February 7, 2014

Comments on the Draft General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement

Submitted by Bruce A. Cox, P.O. Box 475, Eminence, MO 65466

Thank you for the the opportunity to comment on the Draft General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). My wife and I live on a farm in the Eminence area with frontage on the Jacks Fork River. We love the beauty of Ozarks and know there is nowhere else we would rather live.

I enjoy floating / canoeing the rivers of the ONSR, camping on gravel bars when I go on overnight floats, riding ATVs and horseback riding which sometimes include riding in the ONSR. A wake of environmental destruction has not followed in the path of these activities. Needless to say, Alternative B will negatively impact the activities many have historically enjoyed in the ONSR.

About 5 years ago, when public comments were sought on the first draft of the ONSR General Management Plan, about 3,000 local residents formally commented. Most of the comments, including my own advocated the No-Action Alternative as their preferred option. It was very disappointing that this voice was not heard as the National Park Service's (NPS's) selected Alternative B as the preferred option. Is it possible that local residents are not considered important stakeholders by the NPS?

Suggested Alternative Management Strategies For Horseback and ATV/UTV Riders

Avoiding user conflicts seems to be the greatest challenge facing the NPS when it comes to ONSR management planning. How can the NPS manage separate experiences for the floaters who desire to float the rivers in solitude, from those who desire to access the rivers by pickup truck or ATV or ride their horse in the ONSR? Provided one user group (i.e., quiet floating users) does not want to impose their will on all other users for the entire ONSR, lengths of rivers could be designated quiet float areas where ATVs and vehicle accesses are denied or curtailed. This would be a far more reasonable management strategy, than a ban of all ATVs and UTVs throughout the entire ONSR and a limit of horseback riding to designated trails only.

Regarding horseback riding and uses of ATVs and UTVs, it seems more reasonable to allow these activities in remote areas of the ONSR where few visitors go and where there is also limited horseback and ATV riding on a yearly basis. ONSR areas upstream of Bay Creek on the Jacks Fork River are an example where unrestricted riding could be allowed without user conflict. Areas on the Current River where unrestricted horseback and ATV / UTV riding might be considered are the river stretches between Prairie Hollow (below Two Rivers) and Little Bloom Creek (upstream of Hwy 106) and Well Hollow to Paint Rock. There may be other river stretches of ONSR which are seldom floated and therefore qualify for horseback and ATV riding. This management strategy for horseback and ATV/ UTV riding would seldom cause user conflicts since very few visitors (floaters and hikers) and horseback and ATV / UTV riders frequent these areas.

If the NPS is insistent on banning ATV riding in the ONSR and also restricting horseback riders to designated trails, how will the ATV and horseback riders know when they are in the ONSR? Naturally, if a rider is along the river or can see the river, one could assume they may be in the ONSR. But, if a person is riding well off the rivers there are no boundary markers to indicate whether that person has entered the ONSR or is outside the boundary. I'm not sure how many miles of ONSR boundary there are, but it is probably 300 to 500 miles. Does the NPS have a plan for marking their outer boundaries so that horseback and ATV riders will know when they have entered the ONSR?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2655    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 14:24:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing as a concerned citizen regarding the effects of the Draft General Management Plan will have on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. For decades, the people of Missouri have successfully maintained and preserved the health of the rivers and their surrounding areas. We the local folks are more that capable of ensuring the health of the rivers, while permitting the public to use and enjoy the land they pay to preserve. I recommend that the National Park Service take a NO-Action Alternative to prevent unnecessary restrictions on public lands, preserve private landowner property rights and protect our local tourism industry. My husband and I own land that adjoins the Current River. My family actively uses this land year round. My husband gigs in season. We boat and camp with our family. We float and swim with our grandchildren. We the locals feel we are the stewards of the River. The River is a large part of our lives and our hearts. It breaks my heart to think people that don't even live here or understand our connection with the River want to restrict our use of the River.

There are enough restrictions on the River already. Take your Park Rangers out of the bushes, and make them patrol the River. Enforce the laws that are already there, but please, take no other actions to restrict our use of the River.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2656    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 14:28:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Electronically Submitted to NPS on February 7, 2014

Comments on the Draft General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement

Submitted by Bruce A. Cox, P.O. Box 475, Eminence, MO 65466

Thank you for the the opportunity to comment on the Draft General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). My wife and I live on a farm in the Eminence area with frontage on the Jacks Fork River. We love the beauty of Ozarks and know there is nowhere else we would rather live.

I enjoy floating / canoeing the rivers of the ONSR, camping on gravel bars when I go on overnight floats, riding ATVs and horseback riding which sometimes include riding in the ONSR. A wake of environmental destruction has not followed in the path of these activities. Needless to say, Alternative B will negatively impact the activities many have historically enjoyed in the ONSR.

About 5 years ago, when public comments were sought on the first draft of the ONSR General Management Plan, about 3,000 local residents formally commented. Most of the comments, including my own advocated the No-Action Alternative as their preferred option. It was very disappointing that this voice was not heard as the National Park Service's (NPS's) selected Alternative B as the preferred option. Is it possible that local residents are not considered important stakeholders by the NPS?

Powder Mill Educational Center Proposal

I like the idea of building an educational center; however, I question whether Powder Mill is the best location. It is my opinion that Powder Mill is too far away from those areas of the ONSR that attract the greatest number of visitors. Most visitors to the lower ONSR, camp or stay in the Eminence and Van Buren areas. I question whether individuals would travel 15 to 50 miles to attend an educational event. It would be disappointing if the NPS built an educational center that attracted only small audiences.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2657    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 14:28:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In the Draft General Management Plan, Table 9 on page 114 provides cost estimates for the alternatives. First, the questions of whether the estimates for A, B, C are understated and how was the no action number determined? Is the no action number the budget or actual for the current fiscal year or something else? Assuming that all the numbers are accurate, alternative B represents an increase of 26 FTEs and an increase of \$2,239,000 (34%) n annual operating costs over the no action alternative. Alternative B also shows one- time facility costs of \$6,703,000. Alternatives A and C are even more costly.How would alternatives A, B, or C be received if they were advanced by a private business, a state or local government entity? Wouldnt one of the first questions be

Where is the money going to come from? I did see somewhere in the plan that it was not funded. I know this is a 20 year plan but based on what Ive been reading regarding NPS budgets and todays environment I am thinking that there is little if any chance that any of alternatives A, B, C would be fully funded anytime in the foreseeable future. Are A, B, C really viable alternatives in todays times when the Federal government is having a hard time funding the current No Action alternative? Should the Park Service either: 1) accept the no action alternative and do the best they can with the funding they have or 2) go back and come up with some realistic viable alternatives? Are you thinking of a piecemeal implementation? That will no doubt end in a costly convoluted mess.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2658    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 14:31:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My husband Leon and I oppose this plan. These waterways have been used by citizens for years. They were always for the people for our recreation and enjoyment. Many local businesses depend on revenue from recreation activities and gas money, food, etc. that comes with tourist activity. How can our state be known as "vacation land" if the waterways are not available to the public? Do you think Chambers of Commerces in all affected areas will go for this?

Please do not take this public recreation away from citizens from all over Missouri and the world!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2659    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Electronically Submitted to NPS on February 7, 2014

Comments on the Draft General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement

Submitted by Bruce A. Cox, P.O. Box 475, Eminence, MO 65466

Thank you for the the opportunity to comment on the Draft General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). My wife and I live on a farm in the Eminence area with frontage on the Jacks Fork River. We love the beauty of Ozarks and know there is nowhere else we would rather live.

I enjoy floating / canoeing the rivers of the ONSR, camping on gravel bars when I go on overnight floats, riding ATVs and horseback riding which sometimes include riding in the ONSR. A wake of environmental destruction has not followed in the path of these activities. Needless to say, Alternative B will negatively impact the activities many have historically enjoyed in the ONSR.

About 5 years ago, when public comments were sought on the first draft of the ONSR General Management Plan, about 3,000 local residents formally commented. Most of the comments, including my own advocated the No-Action Alternative as their preferred option. It was very disappointing that this voice was not heard as the National Park Service's (NPS's) selected Alternative B as the preferred option. Is it possible that local residents are not considered important stakeholders by the NPS?

Proposal For Full Facilities Campground at Blue Springs ( on Jacks Fork River)

Alternative B would develop a full facilities camping area at Blue Springs on the Jacks Fork River. The Blue Springs area of Jacks Fork is not a heavily used section of the river. Water depths in this area are shallow, and therefore few float the stream in these upper reaches of the Jacks Fork River. I question whether there would be great utilization of a campground in this area. Furthermore, if the NPS is intent on protecting remote areas of the ONSR (which includes many areas above Bay Creek on the Jacks Fork River), why would NPS want to develop a major, full facility campground in this area?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2660    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 14:32:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** NPS needs to change their attitude and strategies with respect to law enforcement within ONSR. I know law enforcement officers are sometimes faced with very difficult people and situations - but they should always be professional and exercise some common sense. Over the years, through my personal experiences and reliable sources , I know of several instances where this has not been the case. With no provocation, NPS officers have been arrogant and condescending . Officers have bragged of going hunting as they are on their way to a shift of patrolling the river. At times when they have questioned an individual and found no violation relative to a suspected activity, they have been intent on finding some other violation no matter how small. Rather than making themselves visible and interacting positively with the public, they are more often found hiding in the bushes. And then there was the incident several years ago on the river near Ellington. NPS officers swooped in on a group of people and there was some trouble. Felony charges were filed against members of the group. After an investigation and other independent witnesses came forward , these charges were dropped . I'm not saying that there aren't times when officers need to assert their authority and use physical force, I'm saying that they don't need to display this stance all the time. I'm not characterizing all NPS officers this way but have seen it and heard of it too many times to write them off as isolated experiences. Relative to the draft plan, I see where the number of citations issued may be used as a measure of whether a standard is being met with the potential of temporarily or permanently closing an area of concern. The number of citations issued could be easily manipulated thereby giving managers carte blanche power to close areas if they want to. Closing an area rather than dealing with a few bad apples says that NPS law enforcement either can't or chooses not to deal with these situations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2661    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 14:33:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Users visiting our web site for information about the General Management Plan left these comments in support of including mountain bike access in the plan and in the area wherever possible. These comments are typical of those we have heard from bicyclists across Missouri in discussing this issue with them:

Terry Jones on Fri, 02/07/2014 - 10:46am:

People and bikes will come to the area to ride with friends and family. Mountain bikers care about the area and the environment. We want the area to stay clean and maintained. Most of the maintenance is done by us free of charge.

Christian on Fri, 02/07/2014 - 9:30am:

As someone that travels to bike quite a bit and enjoys the many bike trails in Mark Twain forest, I encourage you to allow further biking in our great parks. MTBers bring revenue and traffic to our great parks and most importantly, are active in volunteering to create and maintain multiple use trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2662    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 14:34:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Electronically Submitted to NPS on February 7, 2014

Comments on the Draft General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement

Submitted by Bruce A. Cox, P.O. Box 475, Eminence, MO 65466

Thank you for the the opportunity to comment on the Draft General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). My wife and I live on a farm in the Eminence area with frontage on the Jacks Fork River. We love the beauty of Ozarks and know there is nowhere else we would rather live.

I enjoy floating / canoeing the rivers of the ONSR, camping on gravel bars when I go on overnight floats, riding ATVs and horseback riding which sometimes include riding in the ONSR. A wake of environmental destruction has not followed in the path of these activities. Needless to say, Alternative B will negatively impact the activities many

have historically enjoyed in the ONSR.

About 5 years ago, when public comments were sought on the first draft of the ONSR General Management Plan, about 3,000 local residents formally commented. Most of the comments, including my own advocated the No-Action Alternative as their preferred option. It was very disappointing that this voice was not heard as the National Park Service's (NPS's) selected Alternative B as the preferred option. Is it possible that local residents are not considered important stakeholders by the NPS?

#### Proposal For Full Facilities Campground at Blue Springs ( on Jacks Fork River)

Alternative B would develop a full facilities camping area at Blue Springs on the Jacks Fork River. The Blue Springs area of Jacks Fork is not a heavily used section of the river. Water depths in this area are shallow, and therefore few float the stream in these upper reaches of the Jacks Fork River. I question whether there would be great utilization of a campground in this area. Furthermore, if the NPS is intent on protecting remote areas of the ONSR (which includes many areas above Bay Creek on the Jacks Fork River), why would NPS want to develop a major, full facility campground in this area?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2663    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 14:36:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The development of this draft plan has taken many years. There have been many comment periods and many comments. Many people believe that NPS officials have drawn this out, haven't considered past comments, and are going to do what they want to do. There is the feeling by many that there is no use wasting time submitting comments once again. If NPS officials sincerely want take public input into account, they need to consider comments not just from this last comment period but the comments from all the comment periods leading up to this point. Although some do not, a lot of those past comments are relevant to this draft of the general managerial plan.

â€

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2664    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 14:39:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As someone who has been going to the Current since before it was a Scenic Riverway I have many canoeing miles on the river - from Montauk to Big Spring, several jonboat trips below Big Spring, and one cataraft (yes, cataraft) trip from Big Spring to Gooseneck as a shakedown for gear before rafting the Colorado through the Grand Canyon in 2007. I have canoed the Jacks Fork from the Prongs to the Current. I also have many miles on the Buffalo from Ponca to Buffalo City. The point is, I have seen NPS management of rivers in multiple units over many years. And I have to say that the management of the Current and Jacks Fork has been the most lamentable excuse for management of a national river that I have yet to observe. Now you propose to codify this mismanagement in the so-called "preferred" Alternative B.

The NPS has already provided too much access for too many drunken boaters - in canoes, rafts, and screaming jet boats. I no longer visit the Riverways except in cold weather when the drunks have no stomach for getting wet. The NPS "preferred" alternative Executive Summary first paragraph says "management will provide enhanced opportunities for visitors to discover and learn about the natural wonders and Ozark heritage of the National Riverways...Emphasis would be placed on increasing opportunities for visitor education and connections to natural resources and cultural landscapes." This high-sounding goal has no audience for its "emphasis". And, it will do little to redress the abuse that has occurred under NPS mismanagement. The DGMP says: "Alternative B and alternative C would include potential opportunities for new concessions for new campgrounds and shuttle services for river users utilizing non-motorized watercraft. These and higher concentrations of visitors in developed zones may create the need for an additional camp store." So, more drunken canoeists on more parts of the river.

The DGMP also says: "Alternative B and alternative C would share three actions:

1. Increase law enforcement.
2. Provide two additional developed campgrounds.
3. Pursue a rule-making to change the existing regulation to allow 60/40 horsepower motors on certain portions of

the Current and Jacks Fork rivers." In my opinion, the only desirable of these three actions is "Increase law enforcement" - but pardon me if I am skeptical about the reality of that actually happening even if B or C is adopted. NPS has not enforced the rules for the Riverway to date. Credibility, once lost, is very difficult to regain. The change to the existing regulation in point three is a perfect example. A 60 horsepower jet boat has no place on the Scenic Riverways part of the Current, much less anywhere on the smaller Jacks Fork. Yet these boats regularly scream up and down the Current at unsafe speeds, creating large wakes, and endangering non-motorized craft and swimmers. By contrast, the Buffalo, another NPS unit that has many similarities to the Jacks Fork, has a 9.9 hp limit. (Not 99, but 9 point 9.) That leaves the second item of the three. More development in terms of canoe liveries and campgrounds is precisely the wrong direction to take. The Riverway was established to revert its being overrun by development and misuse. To preserve this natural resource for future generations, it needs to be rationed carefully not developed even more fully. The Colorado through the Grand Canyon and many other western rivers have a lottery system. It's time for the NPS to manage the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in a similar way.

While there are laudable goals in the DGMP when it comes to repairing damage that has already been done by ATV's on gravel bars and reducing vehicle access to gravel bars, even if accomplished, they will not truly preserve the natural resource. They will only address the lack of good management demonstrated in the past for this NPS unit.

Therefore, I support reducing access to the rivers by a lottery system for boaters of all kinds. Horse use must be curtailed - not expanded - for water quality and gravel bar aesthetics. No motorized watercraft should be allowed above Round Spring on the Current and above Eminence on the Jacks Fork. A 9.9 horsepower limit on motorized watercraft should be applied to the remainder of the Riverways. Money should be allocated for enforcement of these and existing regulations. I note that the latter is only a provision of Alternatives B and C - which unfortunately also increase the (ab)use of the resource. Alternative A lacks this, a serious oversight on the part of those who drafted it. In many ways a "No Action" alternative has advantages over any of the proposed alternatives - PROVIDED that existing rules are enforced as was envisioned at the establishment of the unit. Sadly, "No Action" has been the rule of the day when it comes to enforcing rules. In the DGMP, the NPS appears to have "sold out" to those local interests who do not want any management of a resource they consider their exclusive property, and, to concessionaires who view it as a means to making money - now.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2665    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 14:39:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking is a great way to increase public enjoyment of the space. Compared to many other recreational activities, mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors. I, along with many others, would love to have more space to enjoy the great MO outdoors with both in- and out-of-town friends.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2666    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Bill Black, Superintendent Ozark National Scenic Riverways 404 Watercress Drive P.O. Box 490 Van Buren, MO 63965

RE: Draft General Management Plan, Ozark National Scenic Riverways

Dear Superintendent Black:

As staff for Pioneer Forest LLC, owned by the L-A-D Foundation, we prefer your recommended Alternative B, and offer the following comments as they relate to your future management for the park.

Some Pioneer Forest lands are located within the legislated boundary of the park, and many of our other lands join the park's fee title boundaries. Our sustainable forest management is clearly compatible with your mission, and our staffs often work together to advance mutual interests.

Hiking trails are a traditional recreation activity in America's national parks, yet trail development has been extremely limited at Ozark National Scenic Riverways. We support the provisions of your preferred alternative which will further develop these recreational opportunities for visitors. Pioneer Forest staff and volunteers have worked together with the park service on development of the Cave Spring Trail and now on the new Current River Trail. Other Pioneer Forest trails are in the nearby area, including our Virgin Pine Walk, Pioneer Forest Interpretive Drive, Brushy Creek Trail, Laxton Hollow Trail, and the Ozark Trail. We will be happy to cooperate with ONSR on similar efforts.

We have watched the horse trails multiply, up and down the rivers, seemingly without direction or planning. The result is that riders often cross onto private land, including ours, without permission. Resolving this issue should be one of your top priorities. We stand ready to assist with improving the equestrian trails where it will result in removing redundant and overlapping routes with better signing and a sustained enforcement effort.

We have several joint projects, such as those for tall larkspur populations at Devil's Well and Akers, and coordinated management at Jerktail Mountain, that provide positive benefits for natural resources. We intend to continue such cooperation.

We hope that as a result of the new General Management Plan the national park will be better managed and that the quality of its river resources will be improved for the future.

Sincerely  
Jason Green, Forest Manager  
Pioneer Forest

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2667    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan (GMP) and Wilderness Study EIS.

We agree that these rivers are national treasures, and applaud your efforts to balance their use and protection, and appreciate the difficulties of maintaining that balance.

We recognize, and want to emphasize, that our shared boundaries, shared missions and shared clientele will require some additional coordination between our organizations as you complete your GMP and EIS and move into follow-up planning and implementation phases for us to effectively meet our objectives. For example, if new horsepower limitations put into effect, there may be increased use or unknown effects downstream on the river outside NPS jurisdiction on the Forest Service section of the Current River. Likewise, some of the trails that are proposed will require coordination with us where recreationists may cross the unit boundaries, and because expansions and restrictions on use within the Riverways may affect levels and types of use that occur on the National Forest. Coordinated public messages addressing restrictions on the river will reduce public confusion. Please keep us informed of your progress in planning and implementation, and who to work with to coordinate planning and actions.

While the Big Spring Wilderness Study Area is located entirely within lands managed by the National Park Service, your study recognizes the proximity to National Forest lands that are managed to protect primitive and natural qualities. History has shown that Congressional actions on agency recommendations for establishment of Wilderness don't always result in wilderness boundaries that match the ones envisioned by the agency. Recommendations for establishment of a Wilderness from lands in the wilderness study area could have an impact on management of adjacent National Forest lands, and this needs to be fully considered in future planning and



discussions.

Also, on page 187, the document erroneously states that by 1935 the Mark Twain National Forest included more than 3 million acres. Even today, the Mark Twain only has 3,060,162 total acres within its boundaries, made up of 1,493,565 acres managed by the National Forest, and 1,566,597 acres of other lands. While I don't have ready access to the exact Forest acres in 1935, in 1947 the Mark Twain National Forest (headquartered in Springfield) only had 1,349,618 gross acres, and 440,250 acres under Forest Service administration, and the Clark National Forest (headquartered in Rolla) had 1,971,895 gross acres, and 882,441 acres under Forest Service administration. If you need other information about our lands records, be sure to contact us.

Feel free to contact me if you need clarification on any of my input.  
Nancy Feakes, Mark Twain National Forest Recreation Manager

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2668    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 14:47:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support cycling on the scenic riverways!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2669    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 14:49:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been living in this part of the country full time since 1978. My parents were born and raised in the Carrs Creek area that is in close proximity to a portion of the river that me and my family visit quite regularly.

My family and I spend at least one day if not all weekend enjoying the Cardareva Gravel Bar. I've been there and witnessed the acts of nature and the acts of humans in this particular area.

To say that the gravel bar is being destroyed and the ecosystem is being disturbed is absolutely nonsense.

I've witnessed floods, holiday weekends where there seems to be an overcrowding of people on the gravel bar enjoying themselves, horses drinking from the river and vehicular traffic driving over the gravel bar and all I have to say is that usually the flooding does more harm and makes more changes to the gravel bar area than anything else.

The locals that visit this area are better stewards of the area in terms of policing it and keeping it clean for others to visit than any resource that the Park Service or anyone else realizes.

I feel that these locals want to see this valuable resource left alone without any participation made by the Park Service to make any changes. Usually when the Park Service gets involved they create more hate and discontent and do more harm to these types of issues than they help.

For once the Park Service needs to listen to the locals that will be directly affected by such decisions and take this into consideration rather than listening to others that only visit these areas once or twice a year. The locals want to keep these waters clean and pristine for "ALL" others to visit and enjoy what nature has provided.

THIS IS OUR BACK YARD AND MY VOTE IS FOR THE PARK SERVICE TO "MAKE NO CHANGE".

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2670    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 14:51:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been employed by Ozark National Scenic Riverways for the last twenty years as a law enforcement ranger. Im not only an employee, but a local who has lived in Van Buren, Missouri my entire life. My comments regarding the General Management Plan draft reflect not only an opinion from someone who has grown up utilizing the river but it gives a perspective based on experiences and knowledge from someone who has dealt with the parks ongoing issues, visitor use patterns and behaviors for the last several decades.

HP Regulation Proposals:

(Non-motorized zones)

I was assigned to attend all four of the GMP public meetings in January of 2014. Almost 95% of the individuals I spoke with during these meetings were not in favor of any changes to the current horse power regulations. I am not in favor of the proposed changes under Alternative B. It is difficult as a law enforcement officer to defend a proposed regulation that you do not believe is necessary or justified. None of the law enforcement officers who work at OZAR are in favor of the non-motorized zones. The upper zones of both the Current and Jacks Fork rivers self regulate. There are currently and have not been any recorded user conflicts with motor boats and non-motorized vessels on those stretches of the river. I should know as I review every case incident report that is submitted. There is also no documented evidence of environmental impacts from boat motors. The water level is too low to run a power boat during the summer when floaters are present. I've worked those stretches of the river during the summer and I've never seen a motor boat during May-August. The proposed changes would prevent locals from hunting, fishing, trapping and boating on the river during the non-tourist season when there isn't anyone floating. Don't restrict the use unless there is a justified reason for doing so. I don't even think these zones should be seasonal. There is enough water to run a boat or there isn't. It all comes down to the fact that when the boats are operating on the river there aren't any canoes or tubes to complain otherwise. The HP could be 60/40 and it still wouldn't affect the non-motorized user groups. The current seasonal zone from 10 HP in the peak season to 25 HP during the winter doesn't make any sense. It should be opened year around to 25 HP or 60/40.

(Changes to the current regulation to accommodate the 60/40)

I am in favor of changing the current language under 36 CFR 7.83 to allow the 60/40 motors. There is a huge percentage of boat owners who own and operate 60/40 motors, including myself.

(South of Van Buren boundary to Big Spring)

This stretch of the river is currently opened to 60/40 HP. Due to the over flow parking issues at Big Spring, I think this zone should be consistent with the HP that is allowed below Big Spring. If larger sized motors are allowed below Big Spring then the regulation should be consistent and allow them in this half mile stretch so boat owners can launch in the Van Buren area. I would propose a limit of 200 HP from the park boundary south of Van Buren to Gooseneck.

(Big Springs to the southern park boundary to Gooseneck)

After spending many years patrolling this section of the river, I think there should be a HP motor limit. However, I don't necessarily think it should be 60/40. I do believe that there should be a zone for local boat owners to operate a larger size motor. With that being said I don't think the river is wide or deep enough for 300 ( ) HP size motors. The extremely large motors can be a safety hazard to other boat operators and non-motorized vessels. In my opinion the HP should be restricted to a 200 HP motor. This would allow a zone for larger motors, yet, not too large. There are some larger boat operators who traditionally motor up from Doniphan, Missouri to eat lunch at the Lodge. This would allow those user groups to continue. There are no environmental impact studies to show that the larger motors are causing damage to the rivers corridor.

Non-motorized Vessels:

The number of permits that are issued to concessionaires should be lowered. The river is over crowded due to the number of canoes, tubes, rafts and kayaks being put on the river at the specific access points

(Waymeyer/Akers/Alley Springs/Cedar Grove). Permits should be lowered or they should be disseminated to other stretches of the river to prevent overcrowding.

In the last two years the number of private vessels floating has strappingly increased. This has caused an abundant of problems at access points where there is limited parking; such as Waymeyer and the Chilton Boat Access on the lower current. Sooner or later the park will have to consider charging a parking fee at fee owned access and launch points. The revenue collected would help provide additional funds for the park to hire seasonal law enforcement rangers. The protection division is not staffed adequately to monitor these parking areas on busy Saturday and Sundays throughout the summer.

Wilderness Area Designation:

I am not in favor of designating the Big Springs section to Wilderness. The designation restricts employees from conducting control burns and patrolling the non-hunting area for wildlife violations. The US Forest Service borders the back side of the proposed area. ATVs currently enter the park boundary from USFS property to illegally hunt.

Prohibiting motor vehicles will handicap the protection staff from protecting resources. This area is already a natural area and managed as such. I see no benefit to the public or the park by creating this designation.

#### Horse Trails and Use:

##### (Upper Current)

The Upper Current is a spider web of illegal horse trails and river crossings. These trails need to be shut down immediately and the park should undergo an environmental assessment to designate trails within this district. The park has failed to manage horse-back riding activity and address the concern that this user group has continued to grow. Had the park created a horse trail and camping system decades ago we would have been proactive verses the now reactive mode. The abuse and damage caused by this illegal activity has to be corrected. I agree with the proposed actions in Alternative B.

##### (Lower Current)

There are currently no designated horse trails in the lower current (Van Buren area). I dont believe its fair to have designated trails in the other two districts and not in the lower one. I would propose that at least two horse trails and possibly one horse camp be erected in this district as well. Back in the late 90s I submitted a request to park management for a horse camp at Beaver Pond, which is located on the Tram Road; South of Big Spring. This area would be perfect for a horse camp as it is not right on the river and does not usually attract many traditional campers. The Tram Road is currently used by some riders in the Van Buren area and would be suitable as a designated horse trail. The horse camp would then be an option for those riding on this trail.

#### Roads & Trail Management:

I agree with the proposed actions in Alternative B. The park needs to close illegal traces and roads to prevent erosion and resource damage. This includes restricting access to agriculture fields that are leased out to farmers who have an interest in their crop. All agriculture fields throughout the park should be gated.

The park has to address the ongoing visitor use patterns at Log Yard and similar gravel bars that allow motor vehicle use. A designated parking area must be established to separate the boat trailers and campers. Campsites should be designated instead of allowing a free for all throughout the gravel bar.

#### Enforcement of Regulations/Laws:

While attending the GMP meetings I heard numerous attendees state that the park doesnt need to create more regulations; that we need to enforce the ones we have on the books. What the public doesnt understand is that our protection staff is stretched out very thin. The Rangers can only be at one place at one time. In 2004, OZAR had 21 fulltime protection rangers and several seasonal rangers. The average number of citations issued was 1,500. In 2013, the permanent staff has dwindled to 15, with no seasonal rangers. The annual number of tickets issued was 422. A decrease in LE staff will affect how many violations are detected and how many suspects are apprehended. In addition, it increases the chances of an officer safety incident occurring due to the lack of back-up arriving to assist. The protection division needs more officers to effectively provide protection for the parks resources and visitors. Any new regulations or changes to how the park is managed under the new GMP will create the need for additional law enforcement personnel. In reality, for any changes to be effective; whether its enforcement of off road travel or horse power limitations, there has to be a strong front of law enforcement officers on the ground to deal with the situation at hand.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2671	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 14:53:01
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make

the park more appealing to visitors.

[Include a few sentences about why allowing mountain biking and/or bicycling in general in these areas is important to you as a potential visitor to the area, to area tourism, etc.]

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2672    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 14:53:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent,

Although I have not spent much time on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, I commend the national park Service for your efforts to manage this national treasure. I always enjoyed my travels through the Mark Twain National Forest and my brief stops along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers during my work with the state of Missouri in Poplar Bluff, Missouri. I have read only parts of the Draft General Management Plan and found it to be quite the extensive document and a monumental task is before you. I applaud your hard work to protect the outstanding natural beauty, ecological vitality, and spiritual qualities of these lands. I was also amazed and pleased to see that you involved several American Indian Tribes in the planning process. As a member of the Missouri Conservation Federation of Missouri, Missouri Coalition for the Environment, and the Missouri chapter of the Sierra Club, I stand with them in supporting your preferred Alternative B in the future management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The ONSR is truly a local, state, and national treasure. In addition to supporting Alternative B, I would recommend and advocate for wilderness status designation for the Big Spring area. It would be ideal if the NPS could reduce motorized intrusion via unauthorized roads and river access points along with reducing equestrian overuse and damage to the natural resources. I support the closing 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and other unauthorized roads. I support the motor-free zones on the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and encourage promotion of even lower horsepower limits on other stretches of the rivers. Scenic easements should be restored to maintain the natural environments and scenery for the public. Impaired riverbanks should be restored but not with heavily engineered solutions. I would like to see the National Park Service avoid increased development and reduce intense recreational use in general. Ecological restoration where necessary and appropriate, should be provided. Again, I appreciate your efforts to protect this beautiful exquisite treasure and the opportunity to be involved in the planning process. You all do wonderful work and I wish you well as you continue your mission of the management of this treasure.

Sincerely,  
Patrick Dwyer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2673    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 14:56:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I grew up splitting time between Black River and Current River. My family and I use Current River year around - floating, boating, camping and swimming during the summer months..... boating, gigging, and camping during the colder months. My young children enjoy doing these recreational activities with me and my wife year around.

Alternative B restricts my recreational use of the area beyond what is acceptable. Motorized boats have been running on these rivers since the inception of the outboard motor. Families and generations have been able to enjoy large sections of the river because of the use of john boats. Fishing, swimming, and boat riding are a part of our heritage. My children and their children should be allowed to have these experiences.

Current River should be shared by all - from the urban visitor that comes to the river once or twice a year, to the local families that love the river more than can be imagined.

Additional restrictions to river access and/or boats & motors are not required.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2674    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm writing on behalf of myself and my parents to share our comments on the Ozark National

## Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan (GMP).

We prefer Alternative B as outlined in the Draft General Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement, with some additions and qualifications:

- No horse campgrounds.
- More hiking trails.
- Sensitive natural and cultural resource management that avoids new conversions of bottomland riparian forests to open fields, or artificial pasture for elk and other animals and focuses on restoration of upland meadows, woodlands, and glades with native vegetation.
- The restoration of impaired riverbanks that avoids developed facilities along the rivers, which are screened from view from the river in any case, and low impact. Heavily engineered solutions should be avoided (e.g. Rock and weirs) and instead NPS talent and experience should be employed to bring natural landscape design and sustainable structures appropriate to the site.
- Prioritization of solutions for problem areas that focuses on low-impacts in riparian zones.
- Approach the designation of mountain bike trails with care for the vulnerabilities of the landscape so that erosion, impacts to biodiversity and water quality are minimized.

Specifically, my experience in the Riverways is the following recreational uses: my friends and I bring our kayaks to enjoy a beautiful, peaceful getaway from the Saint Louis metropolitan area, thus enhancing the economy of the Riverways area. My father is a lifelong MO resident, and my mother has lived here more than 50 years. They both enjoy nature and walking through the forests and along the rivers.

We appreciate the conservation and preservation functions of the National Park because the Ozark National Scenic Riverways are Missouri's largest national park and the country's first national park developed around a river. It sickens me that the park is in worse shape today than it was in 1964, therefore 'no action' is unacceptable. This Park's problems have included the seemingly ever-expanding presence of motorized vehicles and their maze of eroded tracks in riparian areas and on gravel bars; the explosive growth of equestrian use and proliferation of undesignated trails and river crossings (many of which are in sensitive riverine areas or on steep, heavily-eroded slopes); overcrowding in certain reaches of the rivers and resulting conflicts among user groups, coupled with the rowdy behavior of some visitors; and inadequate monitoring and enforcement of scenic easements.

Despite what some vocal locals think, bringing this into National Park protection was the right thing to do. Let's do the right thing again. The people who live along the ONSR did not build them, so the NPS must protect the Riverways for wildlife, the environment, and the future.

Thank you.

-Sara in St Charles (and her parents, Fred and Karen)

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2675	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 15:00:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft Management Plan.				

The Missouri Wilderness Coalition is an informal alliance of individuals and organizations dedicated to protecting the remaining wilderness and wild areas on the public lands in Missouri. We seek the broadest possible partnerships, and focus only on issues that are directly related to the protection of wildness and wilderness.

As an organization with a clearly defined scope, please understand that our comments are limited to the Wilderness Evaluation/Study area near Big Spring; we are not commenting on the overall ONSR Draft Management Plan.

As regards the Wilderness Evaluation/Study area near Big Spring:

Missouri Wilderness Coalition (MWC) supports National Park Service (NPS) actions identified under Alternative B.

Alternative B does not significantly change the long-standing backcountry management of the area.

Alternative B does not change public access to the area in any way.

Alternative B does not change or restrict any currently allowed recreational uses of the area.

MWC agrees with the acreage and boundaries identified by the NPS.

The underground utility line found in the area serves no public purpose and MWC supports its removal.

The NPS training range is only open to NPS employees and not the general public, and could be situated elsewhere. MWC supports moving it.

MWC supports private property rights, and we are pleased that no private properties are affected by the Big Spring proposal, nor are any accesses to private property impacted.

MWC supports appropriate access to cemeteries and traditional religious activity sites. There are no such sites within the area.

MWC supports responsible equestrian use, which is currently allowed and would continue under Alternative B.

The study area has been, and will continue to be, a valuable optional use for visitors to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways that expands opportunities for local outfitters and other commercial enterprises.

The study area has and will continue to provide economic benefit to the surrounding area, specifically the town of Van

Buren and businesses within Carter County.

1/4 1/4

Missouri Wilderness Coalition supports continuing to manage the area just as it has been for nearly a century. It is the

logical and scenically attractive complement to the visitor facilities available at the Big Spring park area.

Thank you,

Greg Iffrig

John Karel

Scott Merritt

on behalf of The Missouri Wilderness Coalition

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2676 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:02:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I BELIEVE THAT ALTERNATIVE A SHOULD BE PREFEERED ALTHOUGH I AGREE THAT ALTERNATIVE B IMPROVES ON THE "CURRENT" SITUATION. I BELIEVE WE MUST BE STEADFAST IN PROTECTING THE CURRENT AND JACK'S FORK AND, IF ANYTHING, SHOULD ERR ON THE SIDE OF CAUTION. THANKS FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2677 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:03:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support a new general management plan. This area is so precious and must be preserved for future generations to enjoy the beauty of the area. I urge you to please adopt a plan that protects the delicate ecosystems of the Ozarks & Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2678 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:03:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent:

I'm writing to share my comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan (GMP).

I prefer Alternative A as outlined in the Draft General Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement.

Specifically, my experience in the Riverways in the following recreational uses: Floating and hiking.

These uses are important to me because:

I feel strongly about the long-term health conservation and protection of our natural Missouri landscape and waterways.

The 'No Action' alternative is unacceptable to me because it fails to address the need for more enforcement of existing laws and standards, to better manage overcrowding, and to improve communication and partnership with local landowners and communities. Further, it fails to address these critical problems in the Riverways:

The issues related to horses, and overuse by extreme numbers of boats, canoes and other floatation devices.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways ('Riverways'), established on August 17, 1964, encompasses 134 miles of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. The Riverways' enabling act has three stated purposes: preservation, conservation, and recreation. As Missouri's largest National Park, it showcases several world-class freshwater springs, caves, and bluffs that are home to fish, birds, rare and endangered native amphibians, crawfish, and plants. It is a testament to Missouri's commitment to conservation that the Riverways is a National Park and was the nation's first National River.

The Current River and Jacks Fork are prime recreational waters in a stunning natural karst area that attracts approximately 1.5 million visitors each year. A 2011 study estimated visitor spending at more than \$55 million with nearly 90 percent of spending from non-local visitors. As a unit of the National Park System, management of the Riverways must ensure protection of the Park's resources in an unimpaired condition for public recreation, education, and scientific value. Among its tasks is sustaining and restoring bio-diversity for the next generation.

The management of ONSR-in terms of resource preservation, sustainable use management, and restoration of natural ecosystems-should rival that of our nation's most pristine and unique public lands.

Thank you. Joyce Gorrell

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2679	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 15:06:10				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support Alternative A, the most environmentally preferable of the Alternatives.				

On my visits to the upper reaches of the Current, the experience has been somewhat degraded by motorboats. Hopefully future management will work to reduce this conflict.

In more than 30 years of visiting the Park, I've been surprised at the small number of hiking trails, so I particularly support development of hiking trails.

There are opportunities to collaborate on hiking trails with adjacent (and willing) land owners.

I encourage management work to continue restoring woodlands and riparian areas, including the use of prescribed fire where appropriate.

I very much enjoy visiting the Park.

Sincerely,  
Hank Dorst

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2680	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 15:06:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Hello,

I writing in support of option A for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Strategic plan. This makes the most sense to preserve the biological integrity of this sensitive ecosystem. It is very clear that this area is very fragile and very prone to disruption by anthropogenic activities such as horseback riding, ATV, motorboat, and motor vehicle usage. By heavily restricting motor vehicle and horseback activities (which have been shown to be VERY damaging to sensitive ecosystems) you will be promoting a more acceptable use and opening up the park to more users. This is a natural area, lets treat it as such. It also makes sense from a economic standpoint too. Many users of the river are people that come from the Greater St. Louis area and float the river in canoes and kayaks. These activities are directly affected by motorboating activites which are harmful to the river and have no place in an area that is pristine such as the Current River and Jacks fork. Do the right thing for the environment and the economic viability of the area and select Option A to protect endangered species like the hellbender so that they can have a chance to recolonize the area.

Thanks,

Jeffrey Hillis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2681 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:07:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** First, thank you National Park Service for seeking input regarding ONSR. As a neighboring land owner, I treasure this park and surrounding areas.

I support Plan B.

I have followed comments on Facebook, read the management draft plans for all proposals, read news articles and have extensively witnessed how the Current River portion of the ONSR has been used for the past 20 years. Not only do I own land on Sinking Creek, a tributary to the Current River, but I float the Upper and Lower Current multiple times per year. I utilize a licensed floating service, Running River Canoe Rental, for many of my float trips with family and visiting friends.

I support Plan B because over the last 20 years, I have witnessed more and more campers, trucks, ATV vehicles (and the like) parked on (our in) the Current. I have come around too many bends to the sound of blaring music from a camper or truck on a gravel bar. I have had to maneuver my kids' canoes around large groups of partiers that are just hanging out in the middle of the river drinking. And, just last year, a family members' canoe was tipped over by a group standing in the river from one of these groups of vehicles parked on a gravel bar.

While most of the floaters enjoying the ONSR are extremely polite and, like us, are there to enjoy the wild beauty of the Current, the beligerant party groups are increasing year after year.

As a National Park, the ONSR should be enjoyed by all who come to its gravel bars, not just those that abuse the responsibilites that come with local access.

I also feel strongly that our corner of the Ozarks is a National treasure and should be protected as such.

Thank you,  
Nancy Dwyer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2682 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:09:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** writing to please ask that you allow mountain biking in our National Parks; it is a quiet, non-pollutant way to see the sights and take it all in

---



**Correspondence ID:** 2683 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:11:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Instead of taking things away from the visitors is not what we need. We need to be giving more. Years past, they were more things to do and see in all areas. Now it is limited to a few chosen areas. That is not right. For example look at Powder Mill. It use to be a nice place to take your family to and now just look. They were several things to go view and observe back then.

The park would have more visitors if they supplied more. For instance, electric and water in more than a few areas. It is needed for people with disabilities and small children. I hear it more and more. So they go elsewhere.

Also the issues with the boats. Why do they need to be removed or told where they can run them. Boat owners had to sell and buy smaller ones the last time the park did the 25 year GMP. I'm sure you have already heard from several people on this matter of helping out floaters in distress. Removing boats would be a very wrong move for the park to make. Lives matter to boat owners, so think about what will happen, when no help will be available for a hour or more. But when people with boats are available, they will respond to people in distress. Minutes counts in times of an emergencies. So please think this matter over more careful.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2684 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:13:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There is no need for any motorized craft upstream of Eminence or upstream of Round Spring. These special areas should remain tranquil and quiet, for both humans and wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2685 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:14:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the ONSR draft General Management Plan. Since 1968 I have been canoeing Ozark streams, including the Current, Jacks Fork, Eleven Point, and Buffalo as well as other rivers in Missouri and in several other states and countries. Like many others, I simply stopped coming to the ONSR for a time as a result of steady deterioration of riverbank lands and of the floating and camping experience. More recently I have returned, though typically in the late fall or early spring, and have come to appreciate that these rivers, in spite of the churning in my stomach at the abuse and degradation they suffer, are still the most beautiful streams I know. They are world-class treasures, and they deserve the best management the National Park Service can provide.

The new draft management plan shows NPS recognition of problems that have developed over the years and a determination to address them. Issues that have particularly concerned me are the unchecked proliferation of unauthorized roads and river accesses that have turned the riverbanks into a maze of eroded ruts and degraded vegetation; the unrestricted access of motor vehicles to gravel bars that creates such a jarring sight for those floating the river and makes finding a gravel bar campsite such a risky prospect; the exponential increase in horse riding on undesignated trails crisscrossing the rivers and their floodplains, destroying banks and causing sedimentation and pollution; and the steadily increasing numbers of jet boats that compete with floaters in the rapids, scare off wildlife, and intrude on a peaceful evening. All these activities are fine in places and in moderation, and the new plan proposes to zone and redistribute the uses to avoid conflict, improve visitor satisfaction, and protect the resource base while maintaining or increasing the total number of visitors and the positive economic impact of the park.

Though I personally prefer certain aspects of alternative A, I believe alternative B is the most realistic compromise among the many uses that have developed over the years, and I strongly support it. The emphasis on restoration of areas degraded by unauthorized roads, horse trails, and access points is very welcome, and the provisions for new and better located trails and accesses, designated campsites for gravel bars accessed by motor vehicles, consideration of a horse permit system, and motor-free zones in stretches of the rivers most popular with floaters seem appropriate

and fair.

The staffing levels for alternative B (Table 10), however, especially with no additional staff proposed for resource management and science, seem grossly inadequate for the amount of resource protection, restoration and monitoring required by this alternative (alternatives A and C, with similar requirements, provide 8 and 10 additional staff respectively). Please reconsider and provide adequate staff for these vital functions.

Finally, I urge you to stand up for your eminently reasonable plan in the face of the highly distorted and intemperate political grandstanding by some elected officials. Though they claim to be speaking for their constituents, they are representing only those with a strongly anti-government political agenda that will end up hurting many people in the Riverways region. It already has, for the ONSR budget and staff have been cut out of proportion to other national parks, likely owing to the unremitting negativity of local political leaders.

From my discussions with people in the region, there are many who want to see better NPS management and think many aspects of the plan are quite reasonable, but they are reluctant to speak out. I believe that properly constituted stakeholder workshops called to address issues that will remain to be worked out after adoption of a new plan would find many areas of agreement.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2686    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:15:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Ozark National Scenic Riverways needs to be managed in the same manner as other national parks. In other words the law and rules need to be enforced.

Option B or a combination of options A and B should be adopted and enforced.

At this time the National Park Service has the opportunity to better serve the citizens of the United States are the owners of this great resource.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2687    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:17:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to see more mountain bike trails built. With the obesity epidemic in our country cycling is a great way to get people active. Mountain bike trails are easy to make and easy to maintain. We have an abundance of federal land in my area and it would be gear to be able utilize it in this way.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2688    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We run a small business just below Van Buren and have been a NPS concessioner for several years. Some statements, analyses, and conclusions in the draft plan raise economic concerns not only for our small business, but other concessions as well as other businesses in the Van Buren area.

First, we see a problem in drawing conclusions on what is happening within the Park based on data that was collected outside the Park. Data collection points for the studies cited included Watercress and the Van Buren boat ramp. These locations are well below the Park boundary up river from Van Buren. No data was gathered at Waymeyer nor Raftyard, within the Park.

Second, we certainly don't claim to have expertise in the field of statistics but we question whether the frequency and sample sizes up and down the river are too small to yield reliable results

Third, in Table 13, for nonmotorized watercraft, Alternatives A, B, and C indicate concession dropoff and pickup locations would be redistributed to reduce peak season crowding effects. At this point we are not sure what this means. For example, if it means establishing separate but comparable put in and take out points for concessioners

which are separate from public put in points it could be positive. If in entails delegating concessioners to less opportune put in and take out points in it could have a devastating economic impact on our float business and our companion camping business.

Fourth, also in Table 13, for concessions, Alternatives B and C indicate potential opportunities for new concessions for shuttle services for visitors using nonmotorized watercraft. Would this not be in direct competition with existing concession contracts?

Fifth, we have some concerns related to Table 4. We are opposed to Alternative A's 40 hp limit from Two Rivers to the southern boundary of the Park. We believe the existing 60/40 hp limit from Two Rivers to Big Spring and the no hp limit below Big Spring should be continued. We are opposed to Alternative B's 60/40 hp limit below Big Spring. This would make the Van Buren gap the only place to run motors larger than 60/40 hp in the area. This has the potential to transfer some of the traffic of boats with large motors that currently go down below Big Spring into the gap. This would have a negative safety impact relative to the existing mixed uses in the gap. For the same safety reasons , we are opposed Alternative C's no hp limit from Van Buren to Big Spring.

Finally, there are several statements in the Plan, including those referenced above, as to possible NPS actions to reduce crowding effects. Implementation of an action in one area can quickly cause a change in use patterns in adjacent areas. For example, a change in the Van Buren area can certainly cause a change in use patterns in the Eminence area - - only a 40 minute drive away. To maintain economic fairness, we would think that the Park Service would need to implement ongoing monitoring up and down the Rivers and make adjustments as necessary if they implement actions to change visitor patterns.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2689	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Mr. Bill Black, Superintendent Ozark National Scenic Riverways P.O. Box 490 Van Buren, MO 63965				

Dear Mr. Black:

RE: Review of Draft Environmental Impact Statement/General Management Plan for Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Missouri

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/General Management Plan for Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Our review is provided pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act 42 U.S.C. 4231, Council on Environmental Quality regulations 40 C.F.R. Parts 1500-1508, and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. The DEIS was assigned the Council on Environmental Quality number 20130325.

Based on our overall review and the level of our comments, the EPA has rated the DEIS for this project LO (Lack of Objections). A copy of EPA's rating descriptions is provided as an enclosure to this letter.

The DEIS adequately outlines the purpose, need, and general management plan for this project. The preferred Alternative (B) seems to address and provide a good balance of the various uses and resources of ONSR. We commend your coordination efforts with various other agencies and entities throughout the development of this project. We would encourage continued coordination with local, state, and federal agencies to ensure that all laws, ordinances, and regulations are followed and all necessary permits acquired. We also would like to thank you for prominently addressing the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of each potential environmental consequence.

Though environmental impacts included in the DEIS were overall minimal, EPA offers the following comments for additional considerations of potential environmental impacts and a focus on minimization and mitigation of these impacts and provide additional information related to the project.

While it is understood that the proposed management process would allow for site-dependent flexibility in management and mitigation practices, it would be useful in instances such as these to include at least a few specific examples of practices and procedures that may be used to meet these directives and how health and condition will be measured. EPA continues to support avoiding and minimizing adverse impacts to air, land, and water quality, including wildlife and their habitat. We would like to suggest that any potential effects or disturbance of fish and wildlife species be minimized to the extent possible through the use of BMPs for such activity.

In the event that there are jurisdictional wetlands impacted by the proposed action, we recommend that any mitigation should occur in the same HUC 8 or smaller watershed as the location of the project impacts. If changes occur in the project purpose, need, alternatives, or impacts between now and the time of issuance of Public Notice, EPA's 404 program reserves the ability to comment further on this project. Information may be generated through the 404 public interest review process that was not documented during the EIS process and should be considered in the final decision. This could include changes in regulation or processes, advances in the knowledge of the resources to be impacted, discovery of populations of threatened or endangered species, new best management practices, and/or improvement in stream or wetland restoration science.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide our comments regarding this project. If you have any questions, please contact Amber Tucker, NEPA Reviewer, at 913-551-7565 or via email at [tucker.amber@epa.gov](mailto:tucker.amber@epa.gov).

Sincerely,

Jeffery Robichaud  
Deputy Director  
Environmental Services Division

Enclosure

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2690	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 15:19:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** The Ozark Area Hiking Team is concerned about the delicate ecosystem of Ozark National Scenic River Park sustaining preventable damage from rampant ATV use, motorized boats, trash, horse tracks in moist trail and manure, and the indiscriminate use of firearms and loud music. The Ozark Area Hiking Team has reached consensus on suggested guidelines and favors the strictest plan: Plan A. Below is a list of detailed suggestions provided by a nature group that prides itself on leaving no trace. Thank you, for your consideration.

1. Firearm use inside the park boundaries should be prohibited and strictly enforced.
2. ATV use inside park boundaries should be prohibited and strictly enforced.
3. Motorized boats on any waterway within park boundaries should be prohibited.
4. Access to waterways by public should be from only authorized points established by park officials.
5. Horseback riding should be separate from hiking trails.
6. Horseback riding on trails should require manure bag catcher attachments on rear of animal with areas near equestrian trail heads for proper manure disposal in order to protect the water system from being polluted by animal waste.
7. Motorized vehicles should be strictly prohibited access to riverbank.
8. Motorized vehicles should be strictly prohibited from parking or camping on or near river bank unless in authorized area.

9. Playing of loud music of any kind especially with electronic devices should be prohibited.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2691    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:19:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the B Alternative.

I lived fulltime near Akers for ten years beginning in the mid-1970s and continue to spend a major amount of my time raising a big garden at what my kids consider their home place, enjoying the river, the trails, the visitors, my neighbors, the rangers, the outfitters, and most everything else.

ONSR is unique among parks because it combines a beautiful natural setting with a community that's called it home for almost 200 years. I'm glad that the natural beauty has been protected from development, but I'm sad that so many families were displaced. Some families were satisfied to sell for the prices they were offered, but more families should have been persuaded to accept scenic easements and continue with their lives.

I believe the rivers were plagued by excessive numbers of floaters in the 1970s and 1980s, when ONSR was unable to control concessions.

The rivers were plagued by unruly behavior which probably reached a peak in the 1990s until ONSR and state agencies began stricter enforcement.

Currently, the rivers are damaged by too much drive-up access. Floaters and other users would have a better experience of the rivers if they could travel greater distances without the sight of an RV. There are more than enough existing access points: for instance, on the upper Current, Tan Vat, Baptist Camp, Cedar Grove, Medlock Cave/Flying W, Welch Cave and Akers.

Medlock Cave and Flying W are a good example of the problem and a solution. I see no problem with allowing vehicles on the existing road, but there's no reason for them to get within sight of the river. Walking two or three hundred yards isn't too much to expect people to put out in order to enjoy a day free of modern transportation.

Medlock Cave is a special treat reserved for those willing to leave their canoes.

I suppose the fields away from the river at Medlock could be a place for RV camping, but it seems to me Cedar Grove and Pulltite provide enough of this sort of opportunity.

Bluff School and the Maggard Cabin are interesting counter examples. They can be reached by vehicle from the west side, but they are better left as glimpses into the past that are reserved for those on foot, just as Welch Cave requires at least a walk or a float.

Part of the legacy of 200 years of human occupation is that there are signs of old houses, cemeteries, roads and so on everywhere. We should be preserving what's left of the homes, honoring the graves and closing the roads, except for the few we decide we really need.

It cheers my heart to see horseback riders. They fit with the period when the rivers were settled. A horse is still the best way to deal with an Ozark stream. But numbers could become a problem on the upper Current, as they have become on the Jacks Fork. Too much of a good thing is bad. ONSR must have a way to control numbers and/or disperse concentrations.

Cooperating with horse liverys to develop more trails would be a good approach. The trails should go to interesting spots away from the rivers, and only come to the rivers for opportunities to refresh. The trails should especially avoid crossing the river.

In all cases, ONSR must accept responsibility for being the final arbiter of how much use the rivers can stand. Work with all interested parties, of course, but in the end Congress gave the USPS responsibility for protecting the

resource.

I would like to see more hikers and bicyclists. Well, not hordes of them. But they generally have less of an impact than other users. They would no doubt appreciate some horse-free trails.

I would like to see much more cultural interpretation. I would like to see much more interaction between long-time residents whose lives have been shaped by the rivers and the day trippers who know nothing but city life.

Over all, Alternative B comes closest to reflecting these concerns.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2692    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:22:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

I have visited ONSR every year for most of my life. My family has land near the Current river and our extended family gathers there every year to enjoy the beauty and wilderness of the Ozarks. We will usually float the Current river once or twice each year.

I support Plan B. I have read the proposed management plan. Over the past 10 years, specifically, I have noticed a change to the "feel" of floating the Current. I have come to expect, and dread, the numerous encounters with trucks and campers yelling at passer bys and making me and my family feel as though we have accidentally stumbled upon their party. I don't believe this was the intent of the ONSR at its inception. This is not how I remember the river growing up.

Stronger management should be given. Actually, it should have been happening from the start. I'm not sure why this behavior has been tolerated for so long. Please adopt Plan B to protect this National Park and preserve it for our future.

Thank you,  
Joseph Dwyer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2693    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:28:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Wilderness Study

I like your decision (Alt. B) for the wilderness plan. I like that you are leaving the CCC camps open to the public, the old barn up, and that you are moving the gun range. I understand that with the paranoia and misinformation that is going around here locally it might not be feasible at this time. But this is a 20 year plan and I think that the option should be open for the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2694    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:32:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please manage the land, rivers, and resources as a wilderness area. These rivers need to be protected and managed with strict adherence to a wilderness ethic as possible and enforced with strict and aggressive policies that will insure that they remain in a condition worthy of their status as national resources.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2695    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:32:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing on behalf of Audubon Missouri, the state operation of the National Audubon Society, in support of better management of public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I believe

that the Riverways' fragile ecosystems and habitats should be protected, while ensuring continued public enjoyment and use.

Although we in Audubon Missouri feel that the NPS has offered three very reasonable alternatives for better management of the ONSR, we mainly prefer Alternative B because it:

- \* Provides a balance of diverse recreational opportunities while protecting and restoring important ecosystem features in the ONSR;
- \* Adds trails and enhances opportunities for visitors to learn about the park's natural and cultural resources;
- \* Restores miles of undesignated roads to natural conditions and reduces gravel bars designated for vehicle access, thereby reducing ecosystem damage;
- \* Provides a balanced approach to horse trail usage within the park;
- \* Increases staffing and establishes a new visitor learning center at Powder Mill;
- \* Restores additional historic structures; and
- \* Strengthens monitoring, research, and preservation projects.

Although we support Alternative B, we are hopeful that some adjustments to this plan would be considered. This would include the addition of motor free zones on the rivers, more hiking trails, and a decrease in the number of legal access points proposed in Alternative B- -we believe there are sufficient legal access points.

The ONSR is a precious resource for all Americans and one of the most beautiful and environmentally fragile areas of our state. It should be managed for the access and enjoyment of current AND future generations of all our citizens. We are grateful to the NPS for taking this important step toward better management of this nationally significant natural resource.

Sincerely,  
Patricia Hagen, PhD  
Executive Director, Audubon Missouri  
Vice President, National Audubon Society

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2696    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:37:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Wow, quite a document. It shows careful and hard work and thought. The study is quite overwhelming to an ordinary citizen such as me, but after devoting as much time to reading it as I could, I have a few comments.

As I see it the ultimate purpose of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is to protect the river so that people from all over the country can enjoy and appreciate its special, if not unique, features. There is a great paradox, because many of those features, its clear water, natural conditions, including wildlife and fauna, sounds and silence and ability to commune with nature and natural and cultural history are immediately impacted and to an extent degraded by the mere presence of the visitors for whose benefit the river is protected.

The trick is to provide the best experience possible for those visitors with the least impact on the preservation of the river and the quality of the visit. To me this means minimum impact visits as much as possible.

With the above in mind, I find that Alternative A comes closest to ideal. I truly believe in limiting the use of motors and their horsepower as much as possible. Alternative A is outstanding in that respect.

I see the argument that allowing greater reaches available to motors than Alternative A allows conforms to historic practices. I don't agree. I have floated on these rivers since the late 1930's. In the early days the typical river trip was truly a "float." We would ride down the river as the current would take us in a 21' long John Boat. Motors were not a part of it. Why not respect that practice and make the river trips true "floats." Of course the more floaters there are the more interference with the experience of the preserved river, but it is a price that must be paid to open the experience to visitors. But, motors are a different matter. Their noise, speed and even smell interfere with the floaters experience too much and the motors are not necessary

to enjoying the experience of the preserved rivers.

The silence on one hand and sounds of nature on the other are an important part of the rare experience that a visit to the Riverways. Accordingly sounds from motors, cars, radios, etc. should be limited as much as possible. I can remember more than one float when we would be passed by boats with radios blaring or we would pass groups on gravel bars with radios blaring. The result is a huge interference with everyone else's proper enjoyment of benefits that preserving the Riverways are supposed gain.

I agree that there should be no parking of vehicles at visitor created crossings. There should be no vehicles allowed on the gravel bars. There is not reason people can't reach the gravel bars on foot or by boat. The sight of vehicles on the gravel bars greatly diminishes the experience the Riverways is designed to provide.

I am all for closing as many roads as possible and creating new trails.

Rerouting horse trails and closing visitor created trails is a good idea. I also question the addition of mountain bike trails, but could live with them.

I favor a significant improvement in interpretation and more and better visitor centers could be good.

The wilderness preservation proposed in Alternative A is the best.

I served a good many years as a local elected official. I can understand the pressure by local interests and I can understand the political need to compromise, but as I see it all alternatives are compromises, but in general Alternative A is the best for the country as a whole and fits the purposes of the Ozark National Riverways in the most beneficial way.

Thanks for your hard work.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2697	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 15:38:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Why wouldn't you want to allow a fun, healthy, family-oriented activity on your trails. Mountain bikers care deeply about maintaining trails, and not making a negative environmental impact. The evidence of this is easily displayed by the immense amount of time volunteered by mountain bikers for trail upkeep.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2698	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 15:38:32				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern:				

Our family of four has visited the park many times. We have taken our girls since they were babies out to canoe on the Current River and hike along the trails. In recent years, we have been saddened to see the degraded condition of a river and landscape that has been overcrowded and poorly managed.

Regardless, the spring-fed Current River is a beautiful float and a wonderful and cold swim even in the middle of summer. That is, if you stay away from the crowds on the weekend. We travel frequently and float other rivers, and even in its current condition, this river and this park rank at the very top of our list. But it needs a solid management plan to continue to be a resource the state of Missouri, and indeed, the nation can be proud of.

The National Park Service should recognize the high quality of the river resource at ONSR. We have reviewed the alternatives, we prefer Alternative B. We hope this time there will be a change to improve conditions at the park and on the river. We want our children, and our children's children to have an opportunity to experience the river as we have for these many years. It is our duty to make comment and commitment to restoring and preserving this national treasure for future generations.

With concern,



Katie Belisle-Iffrig

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2699    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:41:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please consider Alternative B, with additional opportunities for mountain bike access.

Bicyclists in Missouri have a lengthy and laudable history with all of the current land management agencies including NFS, MODNR, MDC and numerous County Park districts.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2700    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:41:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for considering mountain bike use in your planning.

Well designed mountain bike trail have been shown over and over in Missouri to be sustainable and without adverse environmental impact. The various advocacy groups, including the Gateway Off Road Cyclists have a long history of working with Missouri Conservation and local county park administrations to construct and maintain trails that are open not only to mountain bikes but hikers as well. These partnerships are a model for the community involvement that our parks and conservation areas.

I urge you to consider cycling and mountain biking groups in your planning for access to Scenic Riverways planning, and to give more consideration to mountain biking access.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2701    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:43:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I hope you give strong attention to the mountain bike access.

As former Parks and Recreation Director of Warsaw Mo I can tell you I have seen it at the front lines, how access(opportunities) can change a community.

Our area did not have mountain biking access when I first moved to Warsaw Mo.

A movement started and life started to change. The City planner had a Trails plan, we had ideas and implemented the plan. It was Mountain bike access that gave the first opportunities to cyclist. People are using this system year round. Tourism up, healthier living up. This is covering all ages.

17 year old Warsaw kid is the State champion because of opportunity,

63 year old kid finishes The tour Divide 3100 miles in 31 day he trained in Warsaw.

3 races a year, and home of the 2012 and 2014 Missouri State Championship Race, opportunity.

And now a volunteer movement with the Osage Lakes Greenway Corp.

We need to be able to keep people in touch with nature, because of opportunity I get to have some of my best family times touring Missouri in search out new places to ride.

Warsaw is a great example of good plans, good city council, and opening up the trails to cyclist/ families just invite us and people will come to explore.

Mac

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2702    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:44:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** No no no!

Do NOT allow people to trample all over our precious pristine wilderness in boats, RVs, horses, whatever. Keep the wilderness wild! It makes me ill to think that what so many of us cherish, others see only as a way to increase the bottom line. NO. Mark my words, I and many others are watching this closely, and those who try to promote this will not be voted for. We already have issues with hiking trails being ruined by mountain bikes. If people want to go into wild places, they need to hike in. If they want to ride rides...then go to Disneyland, and stay out of the

wilderness!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2703 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:47:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was created by Congress for: "...preservation of the Current River and Jacks Fork River's free-flowing streams'springs and caves, management of wildlife ..." (Aug. 17, 1964) It is the responsibility of the National Park Service to ensure that these resources are protected.

I support the following:

-Strong enforcement of horsepower limits. I support the motor-free zones for the upper reaches of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and year-round provisions for motors on other river portions as proposed in Alternative A.

-To reduce the damage to water quality and wildlife by horse overuse, the Park Service must implement action as described in Alternative A.

-The Park Service must quickly develop a plan for closing undesignated roads and access points to the rivers. Over the last 30 years, because of a lack of Park Service oversight, there have been many roads and access points carved into the rivers causing water quality to degrade. Over time, these roads must be closed and authorized access points restored.

Our wilderness areas are fragile. Once damaged, they are slow to heal. Therefore, I strongly support Alternative A.

Thank-you for considering my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2704 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:55:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in support of opening the trails of the Ozark Scenic Waterways Area to mountain bikes. I have had only good experiences interacting with other trail users over the many years I've been mountain biking in all areas of Missouri.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2705 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:59:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a mountain biker, I implore you add more mountain bike access to our trails in the General Management plan. I am opposed to the no-action option, which effectively shuts out our trail user group on many of our trails in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking as a sport as spawned countless trail stewards. We are responsible for the construction and maintenance of many trails that all user groups have enjoyed due to the fact that they are well-built and cared for. Over the years, mountain bikers really do self-police in terms of avoiding damaging trail use and education. We put our blood sweat and tears into creation and maintenance and because of that, mountain bikers really try to minimize their impact in sensitive areas, as we care very deeply about and are incredibly proud of our states beautiful trail system.

Missouri has a large and growing population of mountain bike enthusiasts. The net result of mountain biking in the areas that allow access is an increase in trail quality as well as influx of tourism dollars to local economies.

Thanks for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2706 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:59:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Eagle scout here and I support full mt bike access

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2707    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 16:05:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways' Draft Management Plan.

I support Alternative A, with the exception of the Wilderness Evaluation/Study Area in which case I support Alternative B.

I have spent a lot of time in the Current/Jacks For area my entire life, in large part because of my family's farm in Dent county which was purchased by my great-great grandfather in 1866, and is currently owned by me.

My family and I spend our time hiking, backpacking, camping, floating, swimming, sight-seeing, studying, fishing, gigging, and simply enjoying the area in mostly low impact ways. We visit different areas many times every year, and whenever we want to show off the best of the Missouri Ozarks to visitors, we take them to ONSR.

We enjoy the developed areas such as Alley Spring and Big Spring as well as the primitive, undeveloped areas. I would have to say that our single favorite developed area is Alley Spring, and our single favorite primitive area is Bee Bluff on the upper Jacks Fork, at the end of the road past Bay Creek campground. Aside from that, the multitude of awesome places on both rivers, and especially the entire length of the upper Jacks Fork from the Prongs down to Bay Creek, make ONSR and the surrounding lands truly the jewel of the Missouri Ozarks.

In summer we try to limit our use to weekdays and harder to reach places. We almost never float in the summer. As a family we enjoy floating mostly in fall and secondly in spring. By myself, I float year-round and have spent some awesome cold and even snowy days on the Jacks Fork. Most of our floating is done as multiple day trips, where we sleep on the gravel bars and for the most part used to have quiet, dark, wilderness-type experiences.

I say "for the most part" because the rivers have become increasingly difficult to tolerate, due to the massive use of 4-wheelers and 4-wheel drive vehicles accessing seemingly EVERYWHERE these days. It is impossible to find gravel bars anymore where there are not tracks from vehicles and illegal roads coming out of the forest at every turn. I have watched 4-wheel drive trucks trying to cross the rivers (both rivers) get bogged down, tear the hell out of the gravel, and churn up the water. I have been camping on the upper Current in October and nearly got ran over by a jeep that came crashing out of the woods, saw me, drove across the river to look for someplace else to camp, and then drove back across the river to presumably move on to find somewhere else. I have been on the upper Current in fall when 3 boats gigged a pool next to my gravel bar campsite for about 45 minutes. The constant noise of the engines, the smell of the gas, and finally the massive halogen lights that were mounted on the boats ruined my night. When I gig at night we use flashlights and are much less intrusive. I have been picnicking with my family at Round Spring and unable to talk because of boats on the river being so loud it sounded more like a race car track than a National Park Service area.

It has become a gamble anymore. I never know if I am going to have a good experience or be subjected to this kind of stuff. I feel about 1 billion times more sure of what is going to happen on the 11 Point or the Buffalo in Arkansas. I would like to see ONSR ran more like these areas, where those of us who truly enjoy the outdoors can do so. I used to float the Jacks Fork right before deer rifle season every year. That used to be a sure bet.....now I don't even know about that. Even there, every year more and more gravel bars show signs of vehicle (illegal) use.

ONSR needs to change. There is room for multiple uses of the rivers and surrounding lands. Alternative A, and Alternative B for the Wilderness Study Area, provide the best chance for positive change, and the best chance for everyone to enjoy the area on their own terms.

I do not advocate for shutting down motorized use on the entire river, but I absolutely think it is fair to have some portions such as the upper Jacks Fork and upper Current closed to motorized use, and by that I mean year-round.

I think horses are great, but they need to be controlled better. There are way too many at once on the rivers, and their makeshift trail network is massive and eroding land terribly. I agree with the NPS approach to handle this as

outlined in both Alt A and B.

All of the illegal roads and illegal accesses should be closed, without question.

Better hiking trails should be developed in cooperation with adjoining landowners.

Easements within ONSR should be much more strictly managed. The building of clubhouses, land clearing, and even dynamiting on these properties has gone so far as to be absurd.

NPS is failing to properly manage, preserve, and interpret the historical and cultural resources of the area and should remedy this. Alt A appears to address this shortcoming.

Better management of natural areas, wild areas, and primitive areas should be of the upmost importance.

If Alternative A is not truly an option, which I know it isn't because there is no way NPS will actually do it, I would at least find Alt B to be a minor improvement from current conditions.

Thank you

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2708	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 16:07:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please protect this beautiful area from further development. It is crowded enough as it is. Let's leave something beautiful!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2709	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 16:11:10				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft Management Plan.				

The Missouri Wilderness Coalition is an informal alliance of individuals and organizations dedicated to protecting the remaining wilderness and wild areas on the public lands in Missouri. We seek the broadest possible partnerships, and focus only on issues that are directly related to the protection of wildness and wilderness.

As an organization with a clearly defined scope, please understand that our comments are limited to the Wilderness Evaluation/Study area near Big Spring; we are not commenting on the overall ONSR Draft Management Plan.

As regards the Wilderness Evaluation/Study area near Big Spring, Missouri Wilderness Coalition (MWC) supports National Park Service (NPS) actions identified under Alternative B.

Alternative B does not significantly change the long-standing backcountry management of the area.

Alternative B does not change public access to the area in any way.

Alternative B does not change or restrict any currently allowed recreational uses of the area.

MWC agrees with the acreage and boundaries identified by the NPS.

The underground utility line found in the area serves no public purpose and MWC supports its removal.

The NPS training range is only open to NPS employees and not the general public, and could be situated elsewhere. MWC supports moving it.

MWC supports private property rights, and we are pleased that no private properties are affected by the Big Spring proposal, nor are any accesses to private property impacted.

MWC supports appropriate access to cemeteries and traditional religious activity sites. There are no such sites within the area.

MWC supports responsible equestrian use, which is currently allowed and would continue under Alternative B.

The study area has been, and will continue to be, a valuable optional use for visitors to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways that expands opportunities for local outfitters and other commercial enterprises.

The study area has and will continue to provide economic benefit to the surrounding area, specifically the town of Van Buren and businesses within Carter County.

1/4

Missouri Wilderness Coalition supports continuing to manage the area just as it has been for nearly a century. It is the logical and scenically attractive complement to the visitor facilities available at the Big Spring park area.

Thank you,

Greg Iffrig

John Karel

Scott Merritt

on behalf of The Missouri Wilderness Coalition

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2710	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 16:18:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Ozark National Scenic Riverways				

404 Watercress Dr.  
P.O. Box 490  
Van Buren, MO 63965

RE: Comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan (GMP)

Dear Superintendent:

I'm writing to share my comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan (GMP).

While aspects of Alternative A have many positive points, I prefer Alternative B as outlined in the Draft General Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement. The 'No Action' alternative is highly objectionable because it fails to address the need for better enforcement of existing laws and standards, improved management of increased overcrowding, and to increase communication and partnership with local landowners and communities.

My experience in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways includes fishing, swimming, canoeing, and camping with family and friends on both of the Rivers, and utilizing a family owned home on the Current River above Van Buren. My grandparents and I spent many days on the Current River during my childhood. I support the conservation and preservation functions of the National Park, because I hope that my child and future generations can enjoy the area as it was intended when it became a National Park. The primary areas that we use are: The Current River near Van Buren, and The Jacks Fork.

These issues are important to me because I grew up on the Current River, and have seen a sharp decline over the past decades as human use has heavily impacted the river and the surrounding ecosystem. I fully support increased protection of the area in order to preserve the natural integrity of these systems. As a member of a family that has owned land on the Current River for 3 generations, I have witnessed a steady decline in the ecological integrity of the area, and support protective measures in order to preserve these unique habitats for future generations. I went into the field of Natural Resource protection primarily because of the experiences that I had growing up on the Current River, and I understand that we must take protective measures now to ensure that successive generations can

have the same experiences.

The current strain on the rivers caused by overcrowding, excessive litter, raw human waste, unauthorized horse trails, ATV's, and vehicular traffic is no longer at sustainable levels for these sensitive areas. While I wholeheartedly support responsible enjoyment of the Ozark Riverways, I truly believe that we can no longer continue to overuse the resource and expect it to remain healthy. We have the responsibility to both protect and preserve the quality of the park for our children and future generations.

In addition to the my concern over the health of the ecosystem, I am also troubled that I cannot take my own child out on the parts of the Current River on summer weekends, simply because of the environment created by floaters. It is no longer an place where I can take my son and nephew to go for a swim or catch a few fish from a gravel bar. I have repeatedly had to direct their attention away from obscene language, women showing their bare chests, illegal drug use, etc. I am mortified every time I attempt to introduce a visitor to the river, simply because of the obnoxious crowds that dominate the entire river from bank to bank every weekend. We have had countless incidents with tourists trespassing on our property to utilize it as a toilet, trash can, or bedroom. I do not believe that the intended use of this National Scenic Riverways is what it has now become. I expect that as a citizen and taxpayer, I have the right to enjoy the area with my family. We have had to stop using the area near our property, and have to spend extra time and money to travel below Big Spring where the crowds are fewer. My son cannot enjoy the area where I grew up, simply because of the conditions caused by the floaters there. These visitors do not demonstrate any respect for either the natural resource that they came to enjoy or the other visitors. I realize that recent efforts have been made to curtail this type of behavior, and I support continued efforts by law enforcement to restore a family friendly atmosphere. I do not view proposed regulations as a hindrance to local growth and economies; in fact I feel that it would increase tourism as a result of a more positive environment for everyone to enjoy; not just a small selection of folks who want to use it for partying.

I hope that management of the Riverways will continue to ensure protection and preservation of these unique resources in an ecologically sustainable way for continued enjoyment of the Park by all, both local citizens and the general public. I believe that Alternative B has the best balance of these considerations.

Thank you,

Karel Edgar  
Cape Girardeau, Missouri

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2711    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 16:20:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Plan A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2712    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 16:31:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I reviewed the Draft Management Plan and attended the open house at Powder Valley on January 22, 2014. I commend the National Park Service for a thorough and impartial analysis and presentation. With that said, I feel even more compelled to stand in support of Alternative A. No doubt the NPS feels they must find the common ground to gain public acceptance of the proposed management plan. However, I urge the NPS to take a strong stand and protect this most precious asset. Having visited many of the public lands in MO, including the few Wilderness Areas; I realize there are few areas that can be managed to keep them in a natural state. Now is the opportune time to turn around the ongoing degradation of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways by selecting a management plan that protects the river and land, returning it closer to its natural pristine state for the enjoyment of future generations.

I have floated, camped and hiked the ONSR since it was made a national park in the late 60's. Pushing the canoe through a riffle on the Prongs or backpacking to the Falls of Rocky Creek on the Ozark Trail are times not to be forgotten. I have not yet visited Alaska, but the wide hills and shallows of the Current below Logyard make me think I'm in another state.

I have also backpacked and floated throughout Missouri's Ozarks and National Forests, Missouri's Department of Conservation Areas and many NP's around the US. Although the ONSR is still a preferred park to visit with most of the land owned by the Park, the signs of being loved to death and over used have grown steadily. We no longer consider floating most MO rivers, particularly the ONSR, between Memorial Day and Labor Day; instead preferring the spring and fall to avoid the boisterous party crowds and the busy and expanding accesses with the countless vehicles and car campers. However, the price paid in the off season on the river is the roar and smell of the jet boats. I cannot tell you how many times the giggers have decided the river by our nighttime October campsite must hold the biggest suckers! More subtle intrusions to be seen are the boat wakes, waves and motor pollution. And I imagine the impact to fish and fauna under the water and along the banks may not be so subtle. Other excessive uses I've experienced and noted in the plan are the ever increasing horse traffic, leaving their mark on many a gravel bar and along the banks, and the "expansion" of car camping access points. A gravel bar float camp is out of the question if near an access for fear someone will drive through your campsite.

Like me, I'm sure the park service understands the rights of others to use the river, but I cannot agree everyone can use the river for everything. It may not be as convenient for some, but jet boats, which are permitted on most other float rivers in the state, should be regulated at least to align with Alternative A. Additionally, horseback riding should be limited to a well thought out designated network of trails, while canoe liveries should be limited to numbers where visitors are able to enjoy the ONSR in its true wilderness state. People and businesses have no right to turn the ONSR into a water park.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is the only National Park in Missouri with the characteristics and expansiveness of a wilderness. It is truly a national treasure. Given its NP status, a rare opportunity exists to RETURN the PARK close to its natural state. I urge the NPS to take a strong and bold step by adopting Alternative A, thereby protecting the natural resources of the Riverways and the future Big Spring Wilderness.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Regards,

David H. Freeburg Jr.

As a footnote I have one suggestion that may help the general public. Noting the distance or mileage of the major access on the Tables and Charts would provide a better understanding of what percent of the river is being set aside for particular uses. A good example being the actual distance from Montauk to Two Rivers is only 50 miles, while on the tables it looks to be 2/3's of the park.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2713	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 16:41:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the attention given to and consideration for mountain biking and other trail uses within the General Management Plan, and urge you to give increased consideration for mountain biking in this and future plans. I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways. I urge you to allow mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in this and future plans, wherever possible and appropriate.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2714	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 16:44:27				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Ozark National Scenic Riverways is the most beautiful river systems I have ever seen. Being able to kayak, canoe, and swim in the clear clean waters of the Jacks Fork and Current River is an amazing opportunity. I have been able to enjoy the river is all four seasons and each is beautiful. From the endangered plants that grow on the rocky cliffs to the protected animals that live in the water and along the banks, the whole ecosystem is incredible. However, this system is threatened by overuse by concessionaires and visitors. I have paddled and camping along many miles of river and far prefer the more remote sections that do not have private homes along the

banks, thousands of folks floating in tubes on summer weekends, and jet boats roaring by. I am in favor of the plan to limit jet boat access, drop jet boat speeds and limit concessionaire access by capping daily usage or limiting take in and take outs. I am also in favor of increased Park Law Enforcement presence on the river to deal with drunk visitors, littering, illegal river access, and fighting.

The National Park Service is tasked with protecting and managing ecosystems for the future enjoyment of visitors to come. I expect Ozark National Scenic Riverways to do just that- manage the Rivers for the health of the whole ecosystem for the enjoyment of future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2715    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 16:53:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My comments are based on living near the Jacks Fork River near Jam Up Cave in the Greenwood Forest Land Trust. My wife and I spent three years there, but recently moved to Springfield tho still maintain a cabin near the river.

I generally prefer Alternative A, but haven't examined thoroughly Alt. B. My feeling is that the increased protection called for in A is best for the long-term protection of the natural resources of the Riverways. One of the main threats I have seen to the park is ATV and other motorized traffic on or near the streams.

However I believe that the problems w/ ATVs can best be solved in the long term by more education and better law enforcement. I think the rangers do an excellent job and more enforcement should be encouraged.

I support limiting access to the river by vehicles of any kind. I think it's fine to have campgrounds & picnic areas near gravel bars so that local people and visitors can use the gravel bars, but trucks and vehicles should be kept off gravel bars. I think that the number of access points should not be more limited than they are now in general. I think local residents have traditional places which they have used for decades, and I feel it's important to provide access for local folks that does not allow for any vehicles to get into the river or onto gravel bars except for launching boats.

In this regard I hope the NPS can rebuild and slightly expand the access at Buck Hollow/ Highway 17 on the Jacks Fork, it gets a fair amount of local use and needs to accommodate this use.

An official wilderness designation for part of the Big Springs area might be a good idea, but I do not get over that way very often and know little about this proposal. In general I feel the NPS could do more to encourage hiking within the park. More trails might be a good idea.

Also I have read in the local press about use of motors on gigging boats. I feel fish gigging is a fair way to use and enjoy the river, but I think some of kind horsepower limitation would be advisable during the gigging season. I don't really know enough about this issue to comment further.

About boats on the river, I know certain stretches get almost overuse, other streams especially the Jacks Fork, get hardly any use. It would be ideal if commercial outfitters to direct traffic away from heavily used sections of the river during the busiest season. Maybe some limitations of commercial boat access will be necessary in the near future.

I have also read that overuse of certain areas by trail rides is common. I have not witnessed this, but believe that horse use is a great resource for the park that should not be overused.

There are many more issues I could comment on and have earlier in the scoping process several years ago. In general I feel the Park Service is doing a good job managing this park. There could be more done in educating visitors via more interpretative efforts, supporting scientific research in the park, increasing law enforcement, supporting historic and archaeological preservation.

Does the NPS have much support for volunteers groups and individuals in protecting and interpreting the park? I think more public outreach programs are needed to educate folks about issues such as endangered species, local



history, the values of timber to the public, protecting clean water and air. The park can be a real benefit to this part of the Ozarks and encouraging appreciation for its wild and historic qualities will benefit all in the long run. Thank you all for your efforts in planning for the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2716    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 16:53:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** A Carter County native in support of Alternative B

First let me say that I have found the process of participating in the General Management Plan very discouraging. I attended the two DGMP meetings in Van Buren and can honestly say I have never been more embarrassed to be from this area or more disappointed in the NPS. While I'm sure there are reasons for an open house format, I found it woefully inadequate in giving me the information I needed to make an informed comment. I also think it is reasonable to assume that very few have the time or inclination to read all 500 pages of the Draft General Management Plan. Surely a presentation or video outlining the different plans would not be that difficult to produce. The most distressing thing though was the free for all and apparent Tea Party rally that occurred the night of the hearing on the wilderness designation for the Big Spring area. Let me assure you that many people from this area do not agree with the politicians that purport to represent our views as how to best manage the ONSR. As is to be expected many are afraid to speak up in the presence of such a misinformed, irreverent mob.

While none of the plans presented address all of my concerns, I have reluctantly chosen to support Alternative B as the most viable of the three. The No Action option as it has been implemented to this point is not viable for the long term survival of these rivers as we know them. Perhaps if the original intent and purpose of the park were adhered to this would not be the case. Though I have been to much of the park the majority of my comments come from observations of the area between Big Spring and Logyard.

I have spent much of my life in the ONSR area, as have many ancestors and family members. My grandfather, John Edgar Sloan was granted a scenic easement just below Beale Landing. My great-uncle, Russell Lesh lost his farm, his life's dream at Powder Mill to the NPS. I have heard much about how the river has changed from my family and others as well as seen it for myself. One thing that I have heard over and over at the DGMP meetings is, We don't want change. But change is exactly what we are seeing with the currently implemented management plan. I have run a boat on the Current River since I was about nine years old (1970). At that time most of the wooden, motorized boats from Van Buren were docked at Watercress Park. I doubt there were more than a dozen at any given time and you knew who owned each one of them. Tubing was something locals did to cool off, and canoes were usually paddled by sportsmen looking to land a nice smallmouth or those there to enjoy the scenery. People were respectful of the river and to each other. It was a great place for family fun. Back then a crayfish could be found under almost any rock, mussels and eels, while not abundant were not unusual to be seen. Suckers were plentiful most of the gigging season and fishermen were able to enjoy their sport in relative peace on almost any part of the river. Unfortunately the river of my childhood is hardly recognizable now on a summer weekend and increasingly at other times of the year too.

To my knowledge the ONSR is the only National Park in the State of Missouri that is actually a wilderness-type park where visitors can float or camp, that should be something to be proud of. Missouri is known as the show-me state, but what is seen here in the Van Buren area, on summer weekends is certainly nothing most Missourians should want to show anyone. I have heard visitors say more than once... Well never come back. and I won't expose my kids to that. I have been fortunate to have visited a number of our wonderful National Parks. I can say without a doubt that I have never been to any other National Park that permits the type of behavior that can be witnessed in the ONSR. If further elaboration is needed to explain this then I am most certainly wasting my time writing these comments.

One does not have to be an ecologist to see what is happening to the river ecosystem too. Ever increasing growth in recreational use of the ONSR, both commercially and private if left unabated will surely lead to its loss of species if not eventual collapse. What happens if the crayfish disappear completely, will the smallmouth and rock bass be far behind? The endangered Ozark hellbender is only a harbinger of what is surely to come.

There are no shortages of places in our area where one can shoot firearms, run boats, ride ATVs, or enjoy other motorized means of recreation. But it IS becoming more difficult to find quiet places of solitude away from cell phones and other contrivances of man. The ONSR does provide opportunities for this, but for how long? An out-of-town friend of mine, headed to visit the river, will say hes coming to go to church. Anyone whos ever seen the night sky from the foot of Paint Rock Bluff or heard a turkey gobbler call out in the morning fog should know what he means. I would find it hard to believe that anyone having had these experiences would not be moved to think that others should be given the opportunity to experience them in solitude as well. No one likes having restrictions put on activities that they are accustomed to. I hope implementation of whatever plan is approved will use an approach that tries to achieve the desired results with as few additional regulations as possible. One controversial aspect of the proposed management plans is the closing of certain river accesses. I believe the result of not closing accesses will be the eventual increase of motorized boat traffic to the point that the NPS will require day permits to launch a boat. As a frequent boater I would hate to see that. But I dislike the thought of having the rest of the river look like the Van Buren gap even more. An example of what should not be done was the addition of the Chilton Creek boat access. Im sure the thinking was that it would alleviate crowding and problems between boaters and floaters. I know many local boaters were in favor of this, and probably thought only locals would use it. There is an old saying, build it and they will come. And that is just what is happening. Boats that used to run from Van Buren to Paint Rock are now going from Chilton Creek to Logyard. These are not just local people either. This stretch of the river used to be one of the quietest you could find, and regulation wasnt required to achieve it. That is changing. My guess is that the boaters who no longer run the gap have already been replaced by others, and if not, it wont be long. So what was gained? ... Another soon to be overcrowded stretch of river.

The rest of my comments will be directed at addressing the positions of the majority of my elected representatives and those who seem to feel that the main purpose of the NPS is to provide for economic opportunity.

The stated purpose of the ONSR as enacted by congress:

& conserving and interpreting unique scenic and other natural values and objects of historic interest, including preservation of portions of the Current River and the Jacks Fork River in Missouri as free-flowing streams, preservation of springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resource thereof by the people of the United States &

Nowhere does it say that economic development/business opportunities is part of that stated purpose.

Certainly money brought into our area by visitors to the park has become an important aspect of the ONSR in relation to our local economies.

But is it the most important aspect?

Maybe our representatives should ask their constituents these questions:

Do you live in this area because of economic opportunities created by tourism?

Would you like to see our area developed into another Branson?

Do you think we are currently headed in the right direction regarding the use/management of our rivers?

Whether or not anyone agrees with my assessment of the current state of the ONSR or what changes might need to be made, Im pretty sure that I am not in the minority in saying, We are not headed in the right direction, and that most dont live in the area for its well paying tourism jobs. It is an affront to the all of those and their families who gave up or had their lands taken to form this park to continue to see it used in a manner that benefits a few who care little for the river environment or the heritage of those who live here. In recent years our rivers have gained a reputation as a party spot where anything goes. From my observations this is well deserved. People of this area are selling themselves and our rivers short in respect to the economic potential of the ONSR. These rivers deserve better and are far more valuable in being kept in a pristine state that encourages conservation and visitors seeking a family friendly atmosphere. A key to preserving our rivers is to encourage a better type of visitor, one who respects the river, others, and whose primary budget concerns are not related to alcohol. Some things should not be about making money. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways most certainly is one of them.

Should Alternative B not be chosen, the NPS should respect the stated purpose for which this park was created and fully enforce the existing General Management Plan of 1984.

Thank you to whoever has taken the time to read these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2717    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 16:55:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support opening the trails of the Ozark Scenic Waterways Area to mountain bikers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2718    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 16:59:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** (Forgive me for accidentally submitting a comment before I was finished. Consider this the continuation of my previous comment)

As I said, I have seen the many recreational uses in this park, and so many of them have undeniable negative impacts on the health of the river. One thing that I have NOT seen is an Ozark Hellbender, a candidate species for the Endangered Species Act. I realize they are rather elusive animals, but my friends and neighbors who grew up here, tell me "I used to see them years ago, before it got so busy here." I am very worried that NPS is not managing this rare resource (an undammed river in an extremely valuable watershed!) for its natural health. Is it so hard to understand the part of the NPS Mission statement that says "preserving unimpaired the natural and cultural resources" that ONSR Management can easily overlook the perils of human and horse wastes, and the causes of erosion/sedimentation, which is the number one threat to these riverways?

I believe that Managers of ONSR have turned a blind eye to their responsibilities of maintaining this resource for many years. I believe they have kowtowed to state and local politicians, as well as greedy concessionaires for too many years; years that have left this river in worse shape than it was, and ever-worsening shape as years pass.

Which is why I fully support Alternative A.

To the powers that be, to those of you compiling comments and helping make this decision for the National Park Service: Please remember that almost everywhere else in this country, commerce and industry win battles against nature on a daily basis. You can take this opportunity to defend our natural resources. NPS has many park units across the country, but protects a relatively tiny portion of US land, inside which reside some of our country's finest natural treasures. Once these treasures are degraded by poor management decisions, they will never be the same for future generations of people or the rest of the natural world. Please, do the RIGHT THING.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2719    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 17:02:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My husband and I are local residents from Eminence. We have lived elsewhere and have moved back, and during our time away had plenty of time to see and visit streams and rivers that were bordered with private property. They are dirty and unattractive, because each individual resident can dictate what type of junk they choose to build, park, or dump on their property.

We are in support of NPS management of ONSR because it is abundantly clear that private citizens left unregulated are not the best "stewards" of the land, no matter how many Facebook pages they create bestowing themselves with this title. If you look at other local residents' Facebook pages you will find pictures of rowdy behavior on the river being participated in by locals, large 4-wheel drive rides with proud pictures of "slides" caused by 4-wheel drives on public land, pictures of masses of trailers and vehicles clogging gravel bars, etc. Any private land in the gaps of NPS management shows precisely the care and "preservation" that is given to land that is unregulated. In addition, as a year-round local resident it is very apparent upon traveling any "back road" during the "off-season" that the beer cans littering these areas were not left by the "tourists" from the summer before. In fact, most of these back roads are never even known to our summer visitors, yet are frequented by the many local "stewards" who are now so loudly crying about their abilities to be the best managers of the resources in the area. Left unchecked and without government regulation by the FEDERAL government, these special resources would eventually be diminished to the point that they are no longer national treasures or even state treasures. The tourists who spend millions of dollars would be less drawn to visit here, and the local economies would indeed be impacted negatively. The state does not have the money to manage ONSR. The state parks seem to barely be able to function in the "black". The Missouri Department of Conservation is not an agency that even has a compatible mission to preserve the wonderful cultural

resources that are a huge part of this national park.

We are in support of Alt. B with a couple of modifications. Even though we do not use the upper Jacks Fork or Current personally with our jet boat, we know that those areas are near and dear to the hearts of many, particularly during the gigging season. This is a cultural activity that has a strong tradition in all the communities surrounding ONSR. I feel that it would be a very wise compromise, in the interest of local good will, to make a modification to the preferred alternative that would allow the use of jet boats in those areas during the off-season, either full time or at least with a range of hours daily that allow for gigging and trapping. It doesn't seem that jet boats would have much conflict with nonmotorized users during these times, and making that concession would go a long way toward easing local tensions and animosity at the NPS. We feel the NPS has a very challenging mission to carry out, but it will become very difficult for NPS relations with the local residents if there isn't some adjustment on the point in particular. We want the NPS to be able to successfully manage this area that we love and feel that having a better relationship with locals could be a huge advantage in achieving a successful mission.

We agree that unauthorized roads should not be tolerated. Thirty years ago, every local resident didn't have an ATV or a UTV (or 2 or 3 of them) that they could use to take themselves right up to water's edge and across it, or to blaze new trails so they don't have to physically walk anywhere on God's green earth. These vehicles are useful and have a purpose, but that is not to travel unchecked down any new trail they can blaze across NPS land (or MDC land or Pioneer Forest). A small unauthorized ATV trail will eventually become a full-blown 4WD road. And contrary to popular "reaching for straws" tactics by some locals, every old road bed does not end at a historic family cemetery and most were not the original trails of the Native Americans and early Europeans, and therefore not culturally and historically significant "routes of travel" that have to be preserved.

We completely support the removal of the "unlimited" horsepower zone on the lower Current. We feel unlimited horsepower could eventually be a very dangerous thing as boat motors get larger.

We also fully support "reining" in the length of unauthorized horse trails in the park, and establishing another network of authorized trails. Well-managed horse trails could draw additional recreational users and be a big economic boost for the local communities, such as the impact of the trail riders that visit Cross Country Trail Ride in Eminence.

Even though the numbers of non-motorized crafts are not addressed in this plan, we do hope the NPS will look at re-evaluating the limits on these in some areas that have become very congested. The concessioner in the Van Buren area should not be able to dump unlimited numbers of tubes into the river on any given weekend. These hordes of tubes could be a safety hazard for jet boats and other users, as they clog the river and flail about like rudderless boats.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2720	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 17:09:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I like your recommended plan. Please do not change a thing with the recommended plan. Especially, please do not change the horsepower limits below Round Spring to less than 40. Thank you.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2721	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 17:18:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	In a time when we all need more exercise what a great opportunity it would be to have access to some of the most beautiful landscape in the country to ride bikes. As an avid bicyclist this would be a great addition to Missouri's trails. Please let this happen.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2722	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 17:18:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern,

My name is Rebekah (Hampton) Embree, and I have been going with my family to the Current River, every summer, for as long as I can remember. As we drove over and got closer to the gravel road, which turned off of the black top, we would recite a special saying that my dad did when he was young. We still say it to this day. We always looked for the leaning tree and the gravel road that followed to tell us we were almost in paradise! We could not wait to get to the Cardeourea Campground, meet our other family members, get our campsites set, put the boat in the water, and settle in for the next two weeks. During our days, we would get up, put our swimsuits on, because it was too hot to wear anything else, make sugar bears around the campfire, rub on our SPF and hit the water! My daddy, Dale Hampton, taught me how to bait a hook, drop a line, set the hook, and pull in a keeper! We had a special chant for when we would catch a nice keeper bass! When we got too hot fishing, we would jump in and float for a while. I always enjoyed watching my mom and dad watching out for the canoers, or helping them find their way if they weren't sure how much further their float had till they made it to Log Yard, Two Rivers, Powder Mill, Van Buren, etc. My favorite was when we would motor up past Blue Springs and float back by trolling and fishing. This would take about all day, and if I asked, dad would pull over to let me walk up to Blue Springs to see its amazing features. I always thought that I could see the bottom when I looked in! Through the years, I have seen several of my family members get married at Blue Springs and the lasting memories are beautiful!

After returning back to our camp for the evening, we would stay down by the water as long as there was daylight, because camp was always too hot, until after the sun went behind the bluffs.

Then came my favorite part of our time at the river, and still is till this very day. My dad would cook up the days catch, and if we were lucky, the eggs that might have still been in some, of which my brother and I always fought over. After we had ate all the fish we could possibly eat, the friends and extended family would start rolling in, because they knew it was about time for the annual, nightly, log yard jam session, which was provided by my dad, my brothers, my grandpa, my uncle, my cousins, and many others that have become known simply as "Friends Pickin". They would set up in a big circle around the campfire and take turns singing songs about memories of favorite past times. We would play and sing till most everyone was gone, and we still do. It is the memory that I cherish and hold onto each and every year as we get ready to leave our favorite vacation spot, that gets me through to the next summer.

We do this same routine for the next 10 days or so, and it is the best vacation that I can still always remember above anything else. Some people are all about cruises, going to the Bahamas, Jamaica, Mexico, or even Florida, but for me, it will always be Cardeourea Campground on the Current River!

I have seen a lot of my family and friends come and go through the years to our annual camp outs, but as long as we still come together, we know their presence is still with us.

I met and fell in love with Wes Embree, and we got married in October 2012. I knew before we were married, I had to see if he could appreciate the same joy I did for our annual summer camp out. He, being a northern Missouri boy, grew up on the Mark Twain Lake, so it didn't take him any time to fall in love with the Current River the same way I had all those years ago when my family first started taking me. We have been together for over three years now, and married for almost two, and he has came every year to our annual family camp out. We can't wait to start a family of our own, buy a boat and camper, and begin our own family traditions of coming to be with those we love on the River.

Now, I said all of that to give you a detailed description of what my favorite summer time vacation has been, since I was a small child, and for what has continued to be throughout my teen and young adult years. I can only hope and pray that it will be a future option for my children to enjoy as I always have.

Did I comment with technical terms, and sections of the plan that I read, no! I thought I would take the more heartfelt approach and speak to you about my experiences with Current River and that if you take the chance to keep experiencing these things away, what a huge void you would be creating not only in my life, my family's life, but countless others who call this place a little glimpse of heaven on earth.

We have always and forever will continue to abide by all hunting and fishing regulations, and have always treated the Park land with respect. We always clean up after ourselves once our time on the gravel bar is done, which I can only imagine how much worse it will feel, this year, if we can no longer come and enjoy as we have always done.

Please take these things into consideration as you are making your final decisions on this plan. Do not make the decision to take the memories I have made, and stop them here, but rather let me keep making memories that will last a lifetime. Please decide to do the right thing by making no changes to the laws that are already in place for the Park.

Thank You For Your Time and Consideration.

Rebekah Embree,  
Concerned Citizen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2723    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 17:19:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I fully support adding mountain biking as a new trail use. This is a popular sport and an appropriate use of public resources. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2724    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 17:21:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The past few weeks it seems that each time I pick up a St. Louis Post Dispatch or check out the internet I run across an article that has to do with the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. One I read told how the Jacksfork and Current River got turned into a National Park. Seemed to be political. But that is all history. We are now to the point where it is down to the environmentalist and the local community. Many of the local community are environmentalist also. We want to keep the river and surroundings in good condition so that many generations to come may enjoy it also. Some may like to motor and fish instead of float and fish. Both like to camp along the river, some in tents, some in campers, and some under the stars. Can we not just get along. According to plan B some areas will be changed. It is said that roads into the river will be cut out. Camping areas reduced. My husband named off 5 areas that are no longer available for camping because the roads have not been kept up or closed off. Motor size is also an issue, this was changed already in previous years. I think you can see where I'm going. If the National Park Service continues to cut back these things then we won't have access at all. I'm wondering if the environmentalist have thought about how they will get into the area to float if there are no roads to unload and pickup. I hope you will consider the local people, we really do care about the Current River and its surrounding area. Our family has been camping at Log Yard for 35 years, plus our parents and grandparents before have enjoyed the Current River. I hope you will limit the changes so we can continue to enjoy the Ozark National Scenic Way that we call Current River for many generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2725    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 17:26:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Plan B. It is a fair and reasonable approach to protecting our national treasure while keeping it open to local residents and visitors from other parts of Missouri, the nation, and the world.

I grew up in Pike County, Missouri, and family float trips were memorable day trips for us. They were major summer outings for us. We couldn't afford cross-country vacations, but we could go to the river. My husband grew up in St. Louis, and he also has fond memories of floating the rivers. We look forward to taking our young sons this summer for the first time.

Unfortunately, where I live in St. Louis, my 7 and 11 year old sons cannot play in the local creeks the way people who are their grandfather's age could when they were boys. The creeks are polluted due to poor urban planning and residents like myself who were uninformed about what was slowly happening over time.

I understand the importance of preserving these sacred lands and waters. We must be vigilant and forward thinking for future generations. We must think of our kinship to the larger community of people and other living things on this planet.

Thank you for considering my comments. I trust you will do what is best for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2726    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 17:45:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom it may concern,

My name is Wes Embree and I have been camping, fishing, and swimming on the Current river since the summer of 2011. I started going there the year my wife and I started dating along with her family and I have enjoyed every minute of it. It is a place you can go to have fun or just to relax. It has been a family tradition for her extended family to camp together for many years. It is nice to be able to take in the beautiful scenery while fishing or taking a boat ride on the river. It is refreshing to go for a swim in the cool spring fed water on a hot summer day. We always try to leave the river and gravel bars in as good or better shape than we found them. We always throw away our trash and keep the camp site area picked up. It would truly be a shame to no longer be able to camp at the Cardeourea campground. I feel that the laws and regulations for the Ozark scenic riverway should stay the same as they have been in the past and not be changed. It would be pointless to have the resources of the riverway and not let people enjoy them. I know that there would be many people who would be extremely sad and upset if they were no longer able to camp and fish on the river. That includes my family and I. I want my children to be able to grow up and experience summers at the river. It would also impact the local economy with lost tourism money. A lot of these smaller communities need all the help they can get for businesses to be able to stay alive. In conclusion I would just like to say that I hope you leave the laws the same as they have been in the past so that many generations to come can enjoy the riverway. Thank you for your time and consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2727    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 17:48:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Leave the waterways alone!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2728    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 17:52:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have always felt that by making the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers into a federal park riverways our rivers were saved for all. Unpleasant things which were happening to other Missouri rivers whose banks were privately owned was not happening to our two rivers. However, I favor no more harsh government regulations be put on the riverway system at this time as it takes away my right as a U.S. citizen to enjoy the rivers. I thought that in 1965, when this act went into play, all people were going to be able to enjoy the rivers not just a select few.

First, we enjoy taking a day to ride, going on country roads to and along the river I don't want to walk or bicycle and my husband can't do either. Thus, if the roads are shut off, we are left out in the cold as far as being able to enjoy the river. This doesn't seem fair when it was designated for all people. Why can't the road problems be worked out in a different fashion instead of shutting them all down.

Secondly, we like to camp along the river and have done so for many years. We pay our camp fee and always leave the camp better than we found it. What is the point in shutting these places down?

Thirdly, we like to take our boat to the river. We go overboard to be courteous to other floaters. I would like to see no more regulations put on boats and moters than we have. Remember- -These rivers should be for all to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2729    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 18:03:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I favor Alternative A first and B second. I feel the wilderness experience is best served by

protecting the rivers and watershed from noise and introduced animal pollution.

If it is determined that Alternative A is too restrictive, Alternative B does strike something of a balance between preservation and development and would be acceptable.

I'd like to point out that Representative Jason Smith does not represent all the people of Missouri. The rivers "belong" to ALL the people of Missouri, as well as the United States, not just to residents of Eminence, Van Buren and Salem. His suggestion to relegate control of the ONSR to the state is ridiculous and should be ignored.

To do nothing and allow unrestricted use of the rivers is out of the question.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2730    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 18:24:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors. I mountain bike within several state parks in Missouri and can personally vouch for their pristine condition and impact. Horseback riding has a much more significant impact on natural lands and has been supported for decades in national parks.

As a resident of Missouri, and a user of our national park system throughout the country, it is great to be able to access and experience our natural environment. Because a mountain bike promotes personal health and is friendly to the environment, I can't think of a more sustainable way to marry the two together.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2731    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 18:27:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support alternative A as the management practice best suited for maintaining the Ozark Scenic riverways now and in the future. Though I live far from the Ozarks, I've made it a point to make my way to their waterways several times a year for the past 10 years or so. The natural beauty of the rivers in the ozarks is unparalleled in the midwest and is a national treasure. Recently its become a challenge to continue these trips due to the overuse of the rivers for weekend recreational activity. The rivers are overloaded with drunk floaters and giant rafts block the canoes from properly travelling the waterways. Beer cans and other trash litter the river bottoms and banks. Continued overuse will destroy this incredible natural resource for future generations. I feel alternative A is best suited to protecting the rivers so that future generations can enjoy them as much as I've been able to.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2732    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 18:29:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Mr.Black

I appreciate the opportunity to contact you, and thank you for the CD.

My parents are Orlan and Imogene Hardgrave, We own one of the cabins located at the Log yard gravel bar.

As you may know we have been there since the establishment of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and have seen many changes in and around the park.

We have enjoyed the river and it's surroundings throughout that time,however

there are a couple of things that have become an issue that I feel must be addressed. First,I know we are located in a very high use area, but we really don't like people using what we consider to be our front yard as a toilet.

During the summer months we cannot walk down the bank from our yard to the gravel bar with out walking past the smell and seeing where someone has, or on occasion is relieving themselves. We have unfortunately witnessed this more than once, from our front porch. A "no camping here" sign might be too much to ask for but,it couldn't hurt.



Second,again it is an high use area. The vigorous enforcement of quiet time regulations would be greatly appreciated. We sorely miss hearing the sounds of the river(Owls,whippoorwills,frogs,) at night. A droning generator is so annoying,especially when it's 90ft. from your front door. I know with the lack of funds and personnel this is tough. "maybe a sign"

There is an erosion problem we would like to discuss further with you,at your convenience. These are our most concerning issues.

I have no problem with the powerboats other than the overwhelming numbers of them on the river. I don't think horsepower is as big a problem,(although no doubt it could be) as the jetpump itself. Running in the shallow water over shoals has to be devastating to the food chain. And bank degradation from the convoys of boaters on the weekends is quite noticeable. I also run a 25hp jet but try to stay in deeper water,and don't run with the pack.

Again I thank your time, and would like to make an appointment to meet with you in the near future. I have looked over and red through the options proposed and tend to agree that plan B is the best alternative.

I do not envy you. Management of such a huge resource is a daunting task.

I look forward to meeting you. Good luck.

Sincerely,

Roy Hardgrave

Ph. 636 232 5624

e-mail rdbjh@sbcglobal.net

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2733 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 18:29:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

I also strongly support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible. I suffered a crash several years ago because there was not a bike lane or paved shoulder and I had a traumatic brain injury and lost my job as a result. So, the safer rods can be made the better.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2734 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 18:33:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I grew up in Missouri and have spent many magical days and nights on these waterways and the surrounding hills. I would like to see these lands and waterways preserved and managed in a way which will allow my grandchildren to experience them as I have! I enjoyed camping, canoeing, fishing and swimming with my parents and brother and sisters, and, as I grew, with friends and then with my own family. The giant flotillas of rowdy and drunk floaters was not a problem when I was a child, but when I brought my family for a weekend camp and canoe trip, the crowds on the river were loud and disrespectful of others, and of the river and land. I have had the best times on the Riverways when I have been able to come for a stay during the week - it is much more serene! I support Alternative B, with the additional recommendations of the Friends of Ozark Riverways and the Missouri Coalition for the Environment. I feel it wisest to implement a balanced approach, and if we are to err, let us err on the side of "over protecting" these resources for future generations!

Thank you,

Pamela Martinez

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2735 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 18:41:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have lived in Carter County all my life. Growing up, my parents took us to the river all the time- fishing , swimming, and boating. My family was big on gigging and cook-outs. My husband and I raised our kids on the river doing the same things-swimming,boating,camping,gigging,cook-outs with friends.

Comment on the Wilderness Area Designation: I am against the proposed designation of the Big Spring Wilderness Area. The designation will not change how that area is currently being managed with the exception that the fire division will no longer be able to complete control burns. If the area was ever opened to hunting, the law enforcement rangers would have no methods of patrolling the area for violations, other than on foot.

Comment on Horsepower Proposed Restrictions: I am against the proposed changes to Alternative B regarding HP limits. My suggestions and comments are a combination from Alternative B & C.

Alternate B proposed "no motor" zones on the Upper Current and Upper Jacks Fork Rivers. There are no environmental studies that show impact to these sections of the rivers and there are no documented user conflicts on file. During the summer when canoes and tubes are floating these stretches of the river, the water level is too low for boats to operate. these sections of the rivers self regulate themselves. So what the park is really doing is preventing locals from using the river during the off season, when there are no tourists present. Individuals who live in this immediate area and use the river would not be able to hunt, fish or boat during the off season. It seems the park is attempting to restrict boats from these sections of river with no valid reason or justification. These sections should remain the same as in the No Action Alternate.

The mixed seasonal zones that are on the chart show dates from March 15 - Labor Day as a no motor season. The current seasonal zones are from May 15 - Sept. 15. What is the justification for making the no motor season two months shorter? Is there that many tourists floating the river in March and April? I don't see many canoes and tubes on the river at that time. Those seasonal dates should remain from May 15 - Sept. 15. It's confusing to the public to constantly change regulations. I would keep the same seasonal zones that are already in effect in the No Action Alternative.

The plan proposes for 60/40 HP in the unlimited HP section from Big Spring to Gooseneck (southern park boundary). This is the stretch of the river that I spend almost 80% of my time boating on. I do think that there should be a limit on HP in this section, however, not the 60/40. There should be a section or zone of river open to boat operators who have larger size motors and fish on lakes. A limit of 150 HP would be sufficient. Motors with 300 HP have no place on the river of this size. I would be in favor of limiting the HP size to 150.

I am in favor of opening the 1/2 mile stretch of river between Van Buren and Big Spring to the same HP size limit that is implemented below Big Spring. Closing that stretch created numerous parking problems at Big Spring and made it impossible for those who use larger motors in bass tournaments to fish that section of the river. If it was opened, those owning the larger sized motors could launch at Van Buren and motor downstream. This option was proposed in Alternative C.

Comments on Horse Use: I think the Lower Current section of Current River should have at least one designated horse trail for those who live in this immediate area. The middle section has 23 designated trails and it's proposed for the upper section to have 25. I think at least one trail around the Van Buren area would be appropriate and fair.

We who live in this part of the state pay higher taxes to compensate for all the land owned by government. Most of our jobs also pay on the lower scale of wages. We choose to live here because we love the river and the opportunities we have to teach our children how to enjoy the outdoors and nature. As the taxpayers for this area we feel we should have a big input in the rules and regulations for this park that pertains to us. Quite frankly, I don't feel that groups, such as the Sierra Club, should decide that boats should be kept off the river because it interferes with the tourist that wants to float on a tube or canoe. Let them make opinions that effect their own area. Tourism is an important income for a lot of the business's here during the summer, but we like to feel that the river is ours to use the rest of the year. As a rule, the locals are courteous to others on the river, while a lot of the tourists act rude and obnoxious. That's just a gripe of mine that I wanted to share with you.

Thank you for reading the comments I have made and I hope they will be considered in the final decision.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2736    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 18:42:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It is with disdain and distrust for the management by the National Park Service of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. It is apparent the bureaucracy and red-tape, the streamlining of budgets from conservatives and the increase of overly-protective environmental practices and policies have caused the National Park Service to truly lose sight of their job at hand. This job, this purpose, more so, the reason for the existence of the National Park Service was not to make every Federally owned property a cookie cutter project. Same management, same policies, same companies to manage and profit from government services. It is shameful the task presented to the National Park Service has been so grievously handled, specifically in the case of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

It is not through the entitlement of the rich, the powerful, those with resources, that this park should provide management strategies pandering to groups with little real interest in the stakes of the what really happens to the area in and around the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. It is also because of the investments of many of those people that our area encounters the pollution which degrades the Hellbender, not because of standards and practices handled within nor near the riverways. It is gravel, that is choking the fish and water habitat that our people have used as a livelihood, both through tourism and for food at the dinner table, this gravel is not because of roads we use to access the rivers. This is a cyclical process which should be managed.

The key word here is managed. It is not the duty of the Federal government to shut off access to make it easy to manage fewer acres and fewer people so that it costs less money to operate. It is not the purpose of the National Park Service to make everything a wilderness area.

Each property was established with a certain credo, manifesto, if you will. A belief about why it should be managed by the government and what gains should come of this. Each set of founding documents, each proof of federal regulations in the CFR, every legislative action about a federally established National Park Service managed property does not contain the collective memory, the idea for what should truly guide the park service to properly manage the resource. Nor do the selective memories of those with purely preservationist sentiment, purely economic sentiment, nor purely recreational sentiment, nor those with any sort of purely selfish sentiment contain what it takes to properly manage the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

Apparently, nor does the National Park Service administration in Washington, D.C., Omaha, Denver, nor Van Buren who were involved in drafting the present set of General Management Plan Alternatives. The elitist, preservationist lingo slanted with college rhetoric of urban and park planning listed in the General Management Plan Alternatives are purely sickening to those who were involved in the founding, the establishment of, and the true protection of the resources, both natural and recreational, contained within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

This is why the General Management Plan Drafting process for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways should halt. It is apparent the displacement and destruction of a people and of a culture is at the heart of those wishing to close off access to this region's recreationists.

The National Park Service is designed to be the "middle-man" in the process of managing the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. But it is not possible to do this without collective memory, continual reflection on founding purposes, nor without the guidance of people who are actually involved and hold a real concern for this matter.

The Park Service Superintendents, since Art Sullivan, have been transplants for a few years, designed to allow further trespass against the culture and practices through the use of falsehoods and misinformation citing environmental damage and degradation. This, too, should be curtailed.

The lack of real understanding among certain segments of the administration of the National Park Service is evident. There are no, or very few, local employees at the Van Buren office in the higher positions. The people who manage our lands are not truly interested in what is best for the land and for it's visitors. The management has moved away from real life, day to day management, and shifted to the management of guidelines, regulations, citations, and fines.

Regulations and rules are necessary for any society to prosper, for any National Park Service managed land and waterways to prosper, for any individual to perform well within our society, but it is also necessary for a group to know when to reform to prevent a loss of freedom, heritage, and culture, and cause a real obliteration of natural resources. The current management of this ONSR will not be sustainable. Nor will the plans as presented be sustainable.

It is time for reform. It is time to limit not the people who visit, but to truly understand what the real issues are.

This calls for a management commission, an oversight committee, and an advisory board to be established. If the officials of the National Park Service are desiring to comply with government cutbacks, this would be a first and foremost step to curtail a waste of government funds and employee and public time. The commission should be established exactly like it was in the founding legislation, but given more power to direct management policies. This commission should review data and information just as a legislative body would receive testimony and data when making recommendations.

This Ozark National Scenic Riverways needs to be protected, but not from those that wish the gravel to choke up the springs, the trash to lay because no one can access the streams, and the place to be untouchable. In that case, it would have been better to have a lake here. Then you could not tease the people with beautiful resources and continually limit the safe and secure access and access points and use activities that do no environmental damage to the resources.

It is apparent the behemoth of an government organization such as the National Park Service plans to go over the sentiment of the locals, regionals, people who actually use the resources and our local, regional, and state elected officials like a steamroller. Something different must be done. It must be done now. It must be stopped.

If this will not happen internally from the National Park Service, recognizing mistakes, from all our state and federally elected officials, regardless of party affiliation, nor from the people who really are involved in this area, then all hope is lost. Access to this resource should be limited, but by a lake rather than by the limitation guided by the misinformation and distorted pieces of opinion.

This last day of the comment period, this sad, sad day, should be marked by something more than just goodbye to our beautiful roads, our spectacular jet boat trips, amazing horseback riding adventures, traditional hunting experiences, our fishing floats, and other activities. It should be marked by a movement of the people to make the government and the park service do our bidding. It is Our resource. They say it is everyone's, yes. But it was ours first, and it was because we took care of our land and waterways that the ONSR was created.

This should be stopped, not just for my father's sake so he can visit his old homeplace, not just so the tourist can have a good experience here, not just because we don't want to be starved out and forced to move, not just because we deserve a say in this management where we have more stake in this matter than others, but for the sake of the future of the ONSR and for the sake of our children and their future. The Current and Jacks Fork Rivers should not be a picture they look at on their desk from their grandparents' canoe trips on the river where no one can visit and experience- -it should be an experience now and forever. An experience of the freedom from the confines of the urban area, a connection with the experiences with the rivers and bluffs, and an experience one can have at any time they so choose.

So now, the choice is yours, do you destroy a culture, a heritage, history for the sake of misinformed and misguided preservation, or do you listen to the real stakeholders of the situation? So far you have ignored us. Hopefully that stops today.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2737	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 18:50:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I support allowing mountain biking on trails within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I also support improving roads and adding shoulders to roads in the area to improve access for road bicycling where possible.

I oppose the no-action option which will continue the prohibition on mountain biking on all trails with the Scenic Riverways.

Mountain biking has a low environmental impact. Creating mountain biking opportunities in the area will help make the park more appealing to visitors.

Local mountain biking groups are an integral part of building and maintaining sustainable multi-use trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2738    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 19:00:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I just wanted to let you how much I enjoy all the trails that you guys build and maintain.

Thanks so much and keep it up.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2739    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 19:02:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I urge you to support opening certain trails to mountain biking in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2740    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 19:33:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please NO CHANGE to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways! The greater part of my childhood was spent on the Current River. My family has loved, respected and cared for that river for generations. I want my children and grandchildren to have that same access. No action is needed. Please listen to the voices of the majority who actually spend time on the river, not the overstepping Sierra Club and their cohorts who know nothing of that way of life.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2741    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 19:47:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Gravel bar camping is one of the oldest traditions in Missouri. Management of the scenic rivers should allow this tradition to continue. Camping on gravel bars is low impact, much more so than developing camp sites. Further, requiring canoers to camp in improved sites eliminates the wilderness experience of the scenic riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2742    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 19:52:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The purpose of these parks is to preserve nature. This cannot be accomplish until there are more severe limits placed on activities in the parks. There should never be recreational ATV's in our parks. They pollute the environment and destroy the landscape.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2743    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 19:58:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** If the Park Service chooses the Alternative B (NPS Preferred) and closes 20 access points it will negatively affect the economy of the surrounding communities. Closing access points will harm the surrounding canoe rentals, motels, convenience stores, restaurants, and all other local businesses. The plan does not go into detail and say what 20 access points will be closed. This means that the Park Service will close any access points that they feel like. The Park Service has already shown the local communities that the extreme environmentalists like the sierra club, Missouri Coalition for the environment, etc. are more important than the local economies. For example if the Park Service chooses to close Williams Landing and/or Jerktail Landing it will completely ruin the upper Current River between Round Springs and Two Rivers for canoeist, tubers, motor boaters, kayakers, and any other

type of vessel. Without these access points there is no place to launch any type of vessel on the stretch of Current River between Round Springs and Two Rivers. Anyone with any sort of knowledge about economics knows that the closing of access points along the Jacks Fork and Current River will hurt the local economies. In fact there is a section in the Alternative B plan that states the economies of the area will be affected. You and I both know that it will not be in a positive way. When you take the rights away from both the locals who live along these rivers as well as the visitors that come and spend money in the area what are you really trying to do except harm everyone involved? Furthermore, people that are handicapped will not be able to access the Jacks Fork and Current River in the same stretches of river like someone that can physically motor boat or float extreme long distances. Now I know you might be thinking that you cannot make everyone happy, but does the Park Service want to be legally responsible for preventing disabled people from enjoying what is supposed to be a National Park available to all citizens of the United States. **THINK ABOUT THAT FOR A MINUTE!** I think this could get some attention because I believe we have a lot of disabled veterans who will fight for their right to enjoy these two magnificent rivers like any other human being.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2744    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 19:58:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** If the Park Service chooses the Alternative B (NPS Preferred) and closes 65 miles of horse trails it will negatively affect the economy of the surrounding communities. The horse trails around these surrounding towns bring outside money into the communities. The Park Service does not show a map of the 65 miles of horse trails that they want to close, so how would anyone make an informed decision on whether or not this is a good plan. Oh yeah let me answer that we do not trust the Park Service and will not go along with any plan that does not spell out actually what is going to take place. People come and ride their horses during trail rides as well as several other times of during the year. Now you do not have to be an economist to realize that when you close a large amount of horse trails like 65 miles it is going to upset anyone who used those 65 miles of horse trails. Now you might make the argument that the horseback riders will still come back. However, I completely disagree when you take the horseback riders rights away to ride on the trails that they have ridden on for generations and become family traditions, they will find another place to start new family traditions. Just look at it like this, horse trails in the ONSR are not the only trails in Missouri or the United States. Many people will simply stop coming and therefore stop spending their money in the local economies **AND YOU GUESSED IT MAJORLY HURT THE LOCAL COMMUNITIES.** I would like to think the Park Service cares about the local communities since part of the mission is to preserve the cultural resources and traditions of the area. Do I need to remind you that part of the cultural tradition is horseback riding? Another point is that not only do visitors ride those 65 miles of horse trails, but the locals ride them as well. The local people have ridden these horse trails for generations and it is a cultural and family tradition of many people that live in the local area. May I remind you the part of the Park Service mission is to preserve the cultural resources and traditions. You are again violating your own mission. **DOES THIS MAKE ANY SENSE BECAUSE IT DOES NOT TO ME!!**

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2745    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** William Black  
Superintendent  
Ozark National Scenic Riverways  
P.O.Box 490  
Van Buren, MO 63965

February 6, 2014

Dear Superintendent Black,

On behalf of our more than 800,000 members and supporters, the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) submits these comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) Draft General Management Plan (GMP) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

The decisions made in this GMP are critical to the long-term health of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. It is

not a stretch to call this a national park in peril. Since 1984, the year the last General Management Plan was completed, lax National Park Service (NPS) management of natural resources and enforcement of laws and regulations, combined with a drastic increase in recreational use on the rivers has caused highly degraded water and destruction of plant life and wildlife habitat.

Congress valued our treasured lands enough to create the National Park Service to manage the national parks on behalf of the American people. When the Organic Act passed in 1916 - legislation that was championed by a Republican from Utah and an Independent from California - the NPS became responsible for conserving the "scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." (emphasis added) This Act clearly points out the responsibility of the National Park Service to conserve the natural resources and maintain balance of conservation with recreation in our national parks.

A series of bills to designate the Riverways were introduced in the early 1960s, but Congressional differences of opinion about the way the rivers should be managed led to the bills' defeat. A united Missouri congressional delegation rewrote the bill with provisions for hunting and fishing, and property owner rights and the bill to establish the Ozark National Scenic Riverways passed. The park's enabling legislation reflects a mandate for balance of preservation and recreation: "...preservation of portions of the Current River and the Jacks Fork Riverâ€preservation of springs and cavesâ€and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources."

A park unit's purpose statement focuses the NPS' management role at a particular park and at OZAR that statement calls on the NPS to "preserve and protect in an unimpaired conditionâ€the clean, freeflowing Current and Jacks Fork rivers, springs, caves, and their karst origins" and to "provide for uses and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation opportunities consistent with the preservation of the park unit's resources." (emphasis added) The Ozark purpose statement again reflects the need for balance of preservation and recreation.

The Organic Act remains the strongest mandate for managing national parks, the enabling legislation is the legally binding mandate of the NPS at OZAR and the park's purpose statement is in effect to guide management. But at OZAR, the balance between protecting the natural resources and providing enjoyment through recreation has tipped, jeopardizing the ability of the park to survive for the enjoyment of future generations. Resource preservation and recreational use can be balanced without degrading resources, sacrificing the quality of the visitor experience or negatively impacting the local economy. And it must be balanced at Ozark for the park to survive.

Most of the provisions in the Preferred Alternative B could provide that much-needed balance, but without increased staffing and enforcement of park regulations, the park's natural resources - resources important to people and wildlife alike - will continue to degrade.

## WATER RESOURCES

NPS acknowledgement of managing for clean water:

Ozark National Scenic Riverways contains 134 miles of clear, free-flowing, spring-fed rivers - the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. Protecting the cleanliness of these rivers is central to the mission of the NPS and there is significant evidence in the GMP that underscores that importance. The following four excerpts illustrate that the NPS understands that good water quality is a critical part of their stewardship at OZAR:

â€ Exceptionally high water quality and clarity of the free-flowing Current and Jacks Fork rivers has led to designation of these rivers as two of only three Outstanding National Resource Waters in Missouri. This designation has national, recreational, and ecological significance. (emphasis added)

â€ Both rivers are also classified as Tier Three Waters by the State of Missouri. These stringent federal and state standards are designed to protect against any degradation in the water quality of these rivers. (emphasis added)

â€ The National Riverways' water resources are of exceptional quality; however, they are also highly susceptible to pollution. This is because karst terrain does not allow for effective filtration and absorption of pollutants from surface water as it travels into the groundwater systemâ€ (emphasis added)

Recreation activities also have the potential to threaten the water quality of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways if they are not managed properly. For example, manure from horses and petroleum byproducts from gas-powered motorboats can contaminate river water. In their 2006 study, Davis and Barr reported elevated bacteria levels within the lower Jacks Fork River that exceeded the existing Missouri single sample standard, and was attributed to horses and other land uses (emphasis added)

Collectively, these excerpts reinforce that management practices at the park must be designed to ensure that the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers are clean and clear in order to satisfy state and federal standards. The excerpts also reflect the acknowledgement of the NPS that it is the role of a General Management Plan to provide the path to manage park waters responsibly. These water quality standards are in place to protect human health as well as the well-being of wildlife and plant life. Some actions in the Preferred Alternative B, and certainly the practices currently underway as referenced in the No Action Alternative, are at odds with federal and state standards for clean water:

Proposed equestrian management would result in new river crossings that would disturb the water, increase erosion and sediment and introduce manure deposits to new areas of the rivers. Although these new crossings would cause pollution in new parts of the river, the net effect of proposed changes to equestrian crossings in the plan may provide overall benefit to water quality. The Preferred Alternative B also says that "Unauthorized crossings would be closed and restored." NPCA supports a limited number of new equestrian crossings in the context of closing and strictly enforcing currently used unauthorized river crossings.

Establishing a new 25-campsite for horses along the Jacks Fork, as recommended in the Preferred Alternative B, will also introduce new negative impacts to water quality. NPCA recommends locating this campground outside of the national park, which could also provide the added benefit of providing local small business growth for an owner/operator of the campground.

The Preferred Alternative B will reduce the number of gravel bars accessible by cars and trucks, which will in turn reduce riverbed erosion, sedimentation and turbidity. The No Action Alternative results in far too many cars and trucks parked in the river during peak visitor use. The reduction of gravel bars is critical to implement and enforce as current conditions are not only detrimental to water quality, but also to visitor safety.

The Preferred Alternative B calls for managing vehicle access points to the river through zoning combined with an increase in law enforcement. This action should halt rather than "reduce the creation and continuation of undesignated roads in the park unit." (emphasis added) There are already dozens of unauthorized roads and access points to the rivers creating negative impacts to water quality, including to rivers, wetlands, streams, and floodplains. NPCA urges the NPS to halt development of new access points, systematically close and restore the unauthorized access points, and enforce the use of authorized access points in order to restore water quality.

#### NPS Management Policies and the Clean Water Act:

NPS's Management Policies set forth specific rules designed to ensure that NPS will manage and perpetuate surface waters and groundwaters as integral components of park ecosystems and these Policies call for compliance with the Clean Water Act. Specifically, the NPS Management Policies say:

The Service will determine the quality of park surface and groundwater resources and avoid, whenever possible, the pollution of park waters by human activities occurring within and outside the parks. The Service will:

- work with appropriate governmental bodies to obtain the highest possible standards available under the Clean Water Act for the protection of park waters;

- take all necessary actions to maintain or restore the quality of surface waters and groundwaters within the parks consistent with the Clean Water Act and all other applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations; and

- enter into agreements with other agencies and governing bodies, as appropriate, to secure their cooperation in maintaining or restoring the quality of park water resources. (emphasis added)

Importantly, Section 313 of the Clean Water Act requires NPS, in implementing its park management activities, to "...comply with all federal, state, interstate, and local requirements, administrative authority, and process and



sanctions respecting the control and abatement of water pollution in the same manner and to the same extent as any non-governmental entity including the payment of reasonable service charges." (emphasis added)

According to the GMP bacteria in the rivers often exceed standards set by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), creating an obvious threat to human health. In conversations with staff at OZAR, there are times the levels of *Escherichia coli* (*E. coli*) are very high during peak season in portions of the river with a large number of recreational tubers or floaters. Additionally, according to NPS staff, there are *E. coli* spikes in areas with high horse traffic. Although the GMP does not specify the number of times annually that the *E. coli* count in the rivers falls above EPA standards, from conversations and as evidenced by the GMP, it appears to be fairly often: "In locations of high recreational use, bacterial counts can be elevated."

The NPS suggests that to "ensure that this standard [to control *E. coli*] is not violated, the NPS Riverways managers might consider increasing educational efforts to raise awareness of the impacts that river users can have on water quality." (emphasis added)

Since the state of Missouri is responsible for water testing in the rivers at OZAR, NPCA strongly urges the NPS, in cooperation with the state, to develop a communication system to notify people on the rivers that the *E. coli* count is high enough to risk human health. In the Great Lakes, when *E. coli* levels are above a set number of colony forming units (cfu) per 100mL, the public beaches are closed and warnings are posted. The EPA has developed a Beach Action Value (BAV) as a tool for notifying beach goers that levels are high. At minimum, the NPS should implement a system for notifying visitors when these levels are high. In addition, the NPS should consider closing portions of the river until levels are within a healthy range. Finally, the NPS should adopt an aggressive education campaign through local outfitters and at authorized river access points to educate visitors about how human body waste must be disposed of while in the park.

Just last year, a Superintendent's Compendium, issued May 20, 2013, reinforces the regulations for disposing of human waste while in national parks:

"Where a toilet facility is not available human waste must be buried at least 6 inches underground and a minimum of 100 feet from any water source" (emphasis added)

The laws and regulations governing water quality and disposal of human waste must be enforced because given current conditions, and in the No Action Alternative, visitors are either uneducated about the dangers of *E. coli* infection or they are content to recreate in a river with high levels of human feces. Either way, if floating the rivers continues to increase, as it has since visitor capacity monitoring was outlined in 1989 the NPS will need to address this health risk with education and potential closing of some portions of the river.

As a final note, there is no correspondence in the Appendix indicating that NPS consulted with the EPA regarding impacts on water quality that any of the Alternatives presented in the GMP will have.

NPS, EPA and State of Missouri consultation on plan:

NPS's Natural Resource Reference Manual #77 sets forth a comprehensive set of policy objectives related to water resources management within the National Park System. NPS recognizes that "[m]aintaining water in its natural condition, free of pollutants generated by human activity, is an important goal of NPS managers."

As the Manual observes, states have developed best management practices for a variety of activities that may be conducted inside or outside of park boundaries and that may contribute nonpoint source pollution, including, among other things, animal waste management and grazing by wildlife and domestic livestock. Specifically, this Manual notes that "[a]ll parks that permit, manage, and/or conduct the above activities, or if any of the activities occur in watersheds that contribute to park water bodies, are encouraged and advised to obtain their respective state's nonpoint source program management plans and incorporate appropriate Best Management Practice into their resource management plans or individual project plans." (emphasis added)

There is no correspondence in the Appendix to indicate that the NPS has consulted with the State of Missouri regarding impacts on water quality that any of the Alternatives presented in the GMP will have. Record of this communication is important because OZAR has Tier Three Outstanding National Resource Waters as defined by the

EPA and voluntarily designated by the State of Missouri. Under the Clean Water Act, once the existing uses of a water body have been established-by evaluating the water's quality relative to uses already attained-the State must maintain the level of water quality that has been identified as being necessary to support those existing uses. In the case of the Current and Jacks Fork, the State of Missouri has committed to the highest (Tier 3) level of anti-degradation for the rivers. Cooperation between the State and the NPS is critical in order to carry out these provisions.

#### NPS and the Federal Pollution Control Standard:

The Federal Compliance With Pollution Control Standards signed by President Jimmy Carter on October 13, 1978, requires the head of each Executive agency to ensure that all necessary actions are taken to prevent, control, and abate environmental pollution with respect to Federal facilities and Federal activities, and that such agencies comply with all Federal environmental pollution control laws, including, among others, the Clean Water Act.

Among other things, each Executive agency shall cooperate and consult with the EPA Administrator and with State, interstate, and local agencies concerning the best techniques and methods for the prevention, control, and abatement of environmental pollution.

The GMP is not clear to what extent the NPS has consulted with EPA, the State of Missouri, and local governmental units on the impacts that the Preferred Alternative B will have on the rivers' Tier 3 Outstanding National Resource Waters status. The degraded water quality, especially during peak season and especially with the addition of numerous unauthorized river access points and horse trails and crossings, illustrates that there are few measures in place to ensure these regulations and laws governing water quality are enforced. And the GMP in general is very weak in specifying what changes in management need to occur to comply with those laws and regulations.

#### Water quality and the Endangered Species Act:

Anticipated potential impacts to federally and state-list threatened and endangered aquatic species have been covered in Preferred Alternative B and in the consulting correspondence between NPS and U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) regarding the Ozark hellbender (and two other non-aquatic species). This consultation is done to pursue required compliance with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

The park is known for providing one of the few U.S. habitats for the Ozark hellbender. The GMP acknowledges that not much research exists to assess how NPS management of the rivers affect hellbender habitat, however the GMP cites research from the USFWS and the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) that says "â€œdegradation of water quality can have considerable negative impacts n hellbender habitat given the hellbender's dependence on clean, clear, and cool river water."

In current practice, and in the No Action Alternative, there are several instances cited above of recreational river uses combined with a history of lax NPS management and enforcement that cause degraded water quality. Equestrian and vehicle access to the river and the pollutants that each introduce are currently causing and would continue to cause adverse impacts to the Ozark hellbender.

The NPS has analyzed that the Preferred Alternative B would likely provide for an improvement to hellbender habitat, mainly because of changes in resource management strategies. The NPS must continue to consult actively with the USFWS on the health of this fragile and unique wildlife.

#### MOTORBOAT AND NON-MOTORIZED USE:

Generally, NPCA supports the provisions in the Preferred Alternative B for motorized and non-motorized use of the rivers as described in Table 4 of the Draft GMP/EIS (page 48).

NPCA reinforces that current regulations are mentioned in the GMP: "On waters situated within the boundaries of Ozark National Scenic Riverways, the use of a motorized vessel is limited to a vessel equipped with an outboard motor only." On some portions of the rivers, this is limited to 25 hp and in others it is limited to 40 hp.

In practice, the NPS has not been enforcing the 40 hp for some time, but allowing boats of 60 hp on the river. NPCA understands this allowance - mainly because of powerboat industry changes - and supports the necessary rule-

making to allow the 60 hp boats to legally operate in the park.

In addition, NPCA supports the balanced approach to non-motorized zones in the northern Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal mixed-use. The increase in non-motorized zones provides a beneficial impact to visitors and wildlife alike. The resulting quiet in non-motorized areas will allow the park birds and wildlife to settle. And with nearly 18 million Americans participated in canoeing, kayaking and rafting last year it is important to provide a safe and quality visitor experience for those who want to see the park in a slow and quiet atmosphere.

#### HORSES:

Most negative impacts caused by equestrian traffic that are of concern to NPCA are covered in the comments on Water Resources, but a few provisions in the Preferred Alternative B also bear mentioning.

Critics of the action alternatives have pointed to the reduction of equestrian trail miles and a proposed permitting system for horses as unacceptable. The Preferred Alternative B proposes a system that includes "nearly 60 miles of designated equestrian trails" (emphasis added) and includes about 35 miles of newly designated trails. Because of profound overuse, existing trails will be closed and restored, which is a significant benefit to area equestrian concessioners who rely on a good trail system for their livelihood.

The proposed permitting system would help manage horse levels and impacts on the trail system and park's resources. This permitting system must be implemented or simply put, the park will not exist - even in the condition it is today - for much longer. It is hard to imagine people wanting to pay for a horseback experience along severely rutted trails, crossing a polluted river.

In implementing the permit system and in closing trails for restoration, the NPS must work with local small businesses in order to cause the least disruption in their enterprises. There are many national parks in which trail restoration occurs and in which there are permitting systems that control the numbers of horses on trails at any given time. The NPS may find models within the National Park System on which to base changes at OZAR.

#### LAND-BASED RECREATION:

The Preferred Alternative B calls for mountain biking as a new, allowable use, but only on designated trails. NPCA understands that mountain biking is an increasingly popular activity - especially by an age group that is younger than the typical national park visitor. And although providing this activity is a worthy goal, NPCA fears that there are already a number of management changes in the Preferred Alternative B - horse riding and motor boat use in particular - that will require extra enforcement. This need for extra enforcement on currently allowed activities could preclude adequate enforcement of mountain biking on designated trails.

The NPS has analyzed potential negative impacts and disturbances to wildlife and plant life as a result of developing trails where there currently are no trails. This potential negative impact could increase if mountain bikes begin forging unauthorized trails through the park.

More importantly, if mountain biking trails are located close to the riverbanks, erosion could degrade water quality further. Finally, without adequate enforcement, unauthorized trails are certain to emerge as well as potential new unauthorized crossings of the river by mountain bikes. For these reasons, NPCA is not supportive of this new use at the park.

#### STAFFING:

The NPS anticipates an additional 26 new Full Time Equivalent (FTE) positions to implement the provisions of the plan, but none of these additional staff members are dedicated to Resource Management.

"The proposed management strategies are not about doing substantially more; but rather are more about managing differently, in a more proactive way that is in accordance with the purpose of the park. Strategies would (also) help restore environmentally degraded park unit lands and facilities."

NPS envisions 8.5 FTEs in the area of Law Enforcement, Safety, and Emergency Services to "help improve protection and monitoring of cultural and natural resources in key areas of the NPS Riverways."

The balance of new FTEs would be primarily for Maintenance and Engineering Division to upgrade visitor facilities projects referenced in the Preferred Alternative B.

NPCA is very sensitive to the underfunded state of our national parks, but additional staff at OZAR is critical. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is a very difficult park to manage and patrol because its boundary runs on either side of 134 river miles. For the last 30 years, management and enforcement of regulations and laws governing water quality and recreation have been lax and none of the Alternatives will be successful without additional staff and new training programs and a system of accountability to ensure that regulations are enforced. Even the No Action Alternative presumes that existing regulations - again, which are currently not being enforced - will be in place. NPCA supports an immediate increase in the staff of Law Enforcement combined with a staff-wide training and accountability program in order to ensure that laws from the Organic Act to the Clean Water Act, and park-specific regulations, are enforced.

#### ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES:

With about 1.3 to 1.5 million visitors each year, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways provides significant economic impact for local communities around the park. Visitor spending is estimated at \$55.5 million with nearly 90 percent of that spent by non-local visitors. The park directly employs more than 125 staff members and leverages 845 jobs outside the park.

The NPS has identified potential opportunities for new concessions based on the action alternatives. The Preferred Alternative B is projected to create new business opportunity for "shuttle services for river users with non-motorized watercraft and overnight river activities such as guided float trips and guided (hike in) back country trips in the natural and primitive zones." There are likely others.

National parks are tremendous economic generators, leveraging at least one dollar in economic activity for every federal dollar invested and the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is no exception. But it will take open minds and entrepreneurial spirits to find those opportunities created by the action in the General Management Plan.

#### END NOTE:

The NPS calls their charge out clearly throughout the Draft GMP/EIS:

"Congress had charged the National Park Service with managing lands under its stewardship 'in such a means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.' (NPS Organic Act, 16 USC 1)"

NPCA urges the NPS to take their charge to heart because the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is an imperiled national park and will not survive for the enjoyment of future generations without strong NPS management and enforcement of the law.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2746	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 20:01:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I support proposed Alternative B as I feel that it represents the best compromise and integration of all user groups. I also echo Missouri Governor Jay Nixon's sentiment... "NPS must incorporating flexibility into any plan it implements." I'm glad that the National Park Service manages the lands and waters in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and helps to protect the Current River Watershed, along with many other private, state and local organizations and individuals. The protection of the biological and scenic integrity is paramount in this National gem that is the Current and Jack's Fork rivers.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2747	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 20:02:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** If the Park Service chooses the Alternative B (NPS preferred) it will completely destroy my family tradition of fish gigging above Pulltite on the Current River. Gigging season runs from September 15 to January 31 annually. It has been a family tradition in my family for SEVEN (7) generations and the park service is going to take this away. Part of the Park Service Mission is to preserve the culture of the local area. This part of the plan will destroy a large part of the local culture. Not only is gigging above Pulltite a cultural and family tradition, it is a time for families like mine to build memories that will last a lifetime. I strongly oppose any Park Service Plan to restrict motor boats above Pulltite during Peak Season (March 15- Sept. 15) or Off Peak Season (Sept. 16-March14). We as locals from this area deserve the right to enjoy the Current River above Pulltite all year long. We also run motor boats above Pulltite during the summer (Peak Season) for recreational enjoyment and the Alternative B will take this away as well. I may add that running a motor boat above Pulltite is also a cultural and family tradition. I have an abundant amount of relatives that owned or still own land above Pulltite and we would no longer be able to enjoy the swimming holes, gravel bars, and shade trees that my family has enjoyed for over one hundred years.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2748    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 20:03:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** If the Park Service chooses the Alternative B (NPS preferred) it will completely destroy my family tradition of motor boating above Round Springs. As a boy I grew up in Eminence MO but my family either owned farms bordering the Park Service land at Round Springs or leased land near Round Springs. My family also has two cabins on the river near Round Springs. So I would like to point out that even though I live in Eminence my heart and soul belong near Round Springs. I spend vacation days at my family's cabins at Round Springs, hunt near Round Springs, gig above and below Round Springs, motor boat above and below Round Springs, as well as many other outdoor activities. The thought of losing the right to run my motor boat above Round Springs actually brings tears to my eyes. As a young boy with an adventurous personality I would put my father's boat in the Current River at the Round Springs lower landing and run his 25 hp boat and motor up to Sinking Creek and back to Round Springs. During the summer, I would fish that stretch of river above Round Springs, swim in my favorite swimming holes, lie on the gravel bar next to my favorite swimming holes, and have family picnics. I also have a handicapped brother (that cannot walk) that I lift into my father's motor boat and take him for boat rides because a motor boat is more stable than a canoe. If you implement this Alternative B you will also take one of the few enjoyments he gets from life. I hope you realize how much devastation you will actually cause by taking away our rights to use Current River above Round Springs. With the preferred plan B of the Park Service this cultural and family tradition will be stripped from me and my family FOREVER. Again this is so dear to my heart it actually bring tears to my eyes to think about a bunch of Park Service Employees from Colorado and Omaha, and extreme environmentalists getting to make the call on where I can enjoy the river that I have used for the last 27 years. NOT MENTION THAT I HAVE A SON THAT IS ALMOST THREE YEARS OLD AND HE IS NOT GOING TO BE ABLE TO ENJOY THE SAME PART OF THE RIVER THAT I WAS ABLE TO GROWING UP. The holes of water that I fished as a young boy, swam in as a young boy, motor boated as a young boy, and had family picnics as a young boy will not be passed on to my son due to this new general management plan you are trying implement. It is not right for the Park Service to adopt a plan that only benefits the extreme environmentalists, there is not one section in the (NPS preferred) Alternative B that benefits the locals in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Park of the Parks mission is to preserve the cultural traditions, NOT DESTROY THE CULTURAL TRADITIONS!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2749    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 20:04:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** If the Park Service chooses the Alternative B (NPS preferred) it will restrict motor boats above West Eminence on the Jacks Fork River from March 15-September 15 as well as restrict motor boats above Bay Creek all year long. I grew up in Eminence and I have run my motor boat above Eminence regularly. Not only is it a family tradition to run my motor boat above Eminence, but I have helped tourists during floods on many occasions. If the Park Service restricts motor boat use above Eminence and the Jacks Fork River floods I will not be able to run my motor boat from Eminence to Alley Spring and rescue people and their belongings during floods. For example, one summer I actually rescued four tourist's canoes and all of their belongings. I even refused to take any compensation for my time and costs. See what the Park Service does not understand is that we locals help the tourists that float the Jack Fork and Current Rivers and do not expect anything in return. I have helped several other floaters on different occasions and do not expect anything in return. The locals are from these small surrounding towns and we have a desire to help people. All we ask is that we get to keep our rights to these rivers!! I have also

talked to many other motor boat users and they have similar stories of rescuing and helping floaters in emergencies. The Park needs to understand that the Park Rangers cannot be everywhere and it takes the help of the locals to keep everyone safe on these beautiful rivers. If the Park Service wants more deaths and more people to be hurt on the rivers without any help nearby then they are choosing the right plan. I feel that the Park Service needs to completely rethink their ideas on how this will affect everyone involved. It will hurt and probably even kill people on both the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers without the presence of the local motor

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2750    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 20:05:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent,

I hope to be able to float down the rivers with my family and I want them to be clean. I think horses should be able to walk in the river but if they're going to poop they should have to go outside of the river and they should have a reserved spot just for horses.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2751    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 20:05:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** If the Park Service chooses the Alternative B (NPS Preferred) and closes 20 access points it will negatively affect the economy of the surrounding communities. Closing access points will harm the surrounding canoe rentals, motels, convenience stores, restaurants, and all other local businesses. The plan does not go into detail and say what 20 access points will be closed. This means that the Park Service will close any access points that they feel like. The Park Service has already shown the local communities that the extreme environmentalists like the sierra club, Missouri Coalition for the environment, etc. are more important than the local economies. For example if the Park Service chooses to close Williams Landing and/or Jerktail Landing it will completely ruin the upper Current River between Round Springs and Two Rivers for canoeist, tubers, motor boaters, kayakers, and any other type of vessel. Without these access points there is no place to launch any type of vessel on the stretch of Current River between Round Springs and Two Rivers. Anyone with any sort of knowledge about economics knows that the closing of access points along the Jacks Fork and Current River will hurt the local economies. In fact there is a section in the Alternative B plan that states the economies of the area will be affected. You and I both know that it will not be in a positive way. When you take the rights away from both the locals who live along these rivers as well as the visitors that come and spend money in the area what are you really trying to do except harm everyone involved? Furthermore, people that are handicapped will not be able to access the Jacks Fork and Current River in the same stretches of river like someone that can physically motor boat or float extreme long distances. Now I know you might be thinking that you cannot make everyone happy, but does the Park Service want to be legally responsible for preventing disabled people from enjoying what is supposed to be a National Park available to all citizens of the United States. THINK ABOUT THAT FOR A MINUTE! I think this could get some attention because I believe we have a lot of disables veterans who will fight for their right to enjoy these two magnificent rivers like any other human being.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2752    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 20:06:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** If the Park Service chooses the Alternative B (NPS Preferred) and closes 65 miles of horse trails it will negatively affect the economy of the surrounding communities. The horse trails around these surrounding towns bring outside money into the communities. The Park Service does not show a map of the 65 miles of horse trails that they want to close, so how would anyone make an informed decision on whether or not this is a good plan. Oh yeah let me answer that we do not trust the Park Service and will not go along with any plan that does not spell out actually what is going to take place. People come and ride their horses during trail rides as well as several other times of during the year. Now you do not have to be an economist to realize that when you close a large amount of horse trails like 65 miles it is going to upset anyone who used those 65 miles of horse trails. Now you might make the argument that the horseback riders will still come back. However, I completely disagree when you take the horseback riders rights away to ride on the trails that they have ridden on for generations and become

family traditions, they will find another place to start new family traditions. Just look at it like this, horse trails in the ONSR are not the only trails in Missouri or the United States. Many people will simply stop coming and therefore stop spending their money in the local economies AND YOU GUESSED IT MAJORLY HURT THE LOCAL COMMUNITIES. I would like to think the Park Service cares about the local communities since part of the mission is to preserve the cultural resources and traditions of the area. Do I need to remind you that part of the cultural tradition is horseback riding? Another point is that not only do visitors ride those 65 miles of horse trails, but the locals ride them as well. The local people have ridden these horse trails for generations and it is a cultural and family tradition of many people that live in the local area. May I remind you the part of the Park Service mission is to preserve the cultural resources and traditions. You are again violating your own mission. DOES THIS MAKE ANY SENSE BECAUSE IT DOES NOT TO ME!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2753    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 20:08:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to provide my comments on the proposed Draft General Management Plan for the ONSR NP.

I have been visiting the ONSR for the last two decades to enjoy the beauty of the river. In 2012 I was fortunate enough to be able to relocate to within a few miles of the current river and park headquarters. I attended the public meeting at Van Buren and received the copy of DGMP.

I brought my young children floating on this beautiful river over a decade ago and want them to be able to bring their children to the same quality of water in the future. I am very concerned with the water quality of the river and I believe this should outweigh all other concerns. We enjoy kayaking, canoeing, tubing, camping, fishing, hiking and atving in this area.

After reviewing all the alternatives I stand by Southeast Missouri Congressman Jason Smith in defending the 'No Action' Plan.

The 'Action' should be to enforce the current rules to keep these rivers safe and clean.

The people that visit these waterways do not want more regulation. I do not support any form of permit system, nor do I support banning camping on gravel bars except if accessed by the river. I do not support any encroachment on primitive camping.

Southeast Missouri Congressman Jason Smith said in a released statement that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways are "already over-managed."

"The Riverways support a vibrant and growing tourism industry that is critical to our region," Smith said. "I support the 'no-action' proposal that would make no changes to the current operating system and I will strongly advocate against further encroachment by the Park Service on our public lands."

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2754    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 20:08:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a frequent visitor to the Scenic Riverways, I have seen the damage done by ATVs, unauthorized roads and horse trails, and extensive jetboat use. When floating the upper Jacks Fork, something I do every summer when the river is too low for most people to float it, I see ATV trails coming down to many of the gravel bars and ATV tracks on the bars and crossing the stream, and have even seen campers pulled up onto gravel bars below Bay Creek.

In floating and fishing the Current between Round Spring and Logyard, I have noted the widening and shallowing of riffles and pools. I've floated this river for more than 40 years, and in that time most of the narrow, difficult to navigate "chutes" have disappeared, and some of the deep pools have widened and shallowed. Some believe this to

be the result of too much gravel, and decry the lack of gravel dredging, but I know the science refutes this notion- - gravel dredging is almost never beneficial and usually very harmful. No, the widening and shallowing is due to bank erosion, especially of those alluvial banks that have a layer of topsoil over a thick bed of gravel. I and many other long time floaters believe this to be largely the result of the incessant jet boat wakes pounding the banks, loosening and damaging that narrow zone at water's edge, giving floods an area to attack and wash away. So even though I own a jetboat and use it on Current River in the fall and winter, I am all for any kind of restrictions on jetboats.

For those reasons, I prefer the most restrictive alternative of the management plans. I could live with the middle alternative, which is apparently the preferred one, but I am unalterably opposed to leaving things as they are. I believe many of the unauthorized access roads should be closed, and jet boat use restricted above Two Rivers.

Please do not let the vocal minority of local residents that apparently care only about their own pleasure and the ability to sell jetboats and ATVs sway the Park Service from doing what it best for the resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2755    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 20:12:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This comment is submitted in support of the National Park Service's (NPS) Alternative B from its Draft General Management Plan (GMP) for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR).

Though I am not a resident of Missouri, I have had the opportunity to visit the ONSR and I plan to return. The clarity of the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers is stunning, and the two springs I had the good fortune to see, Alley and Big Springs, are true forces of nature. The karst hydrogeological system is a national treasure, and I would like to see it preserved for all Americans.

The enabling legislation for the ONSR, passed by Congress in 1964 and providing the blueprint for the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, notes several values protected by the ONSR. Of particular importance to Alternative B to the GMP are the values of "preservation of springs and caves" and "provisions for use and enjoyment" of recreational resources "by the people of the United States." The ONSR is currently managed under a management plan approved in 1984.

The choice of the word "preservation" shows clear intent by Congress to keep the springs and caves of the protected area of the Ozarks pristine. In 2011, American Rivers, a private corporation dedicated to the protection of the nation's waterways, named the ONSR among the top ten most endangered waterways based in part on poor planning. Now is the time to enact an updated plan to ensure Congress' intent in establishing the ONSR, and Alternative B balances preservation with the uses that visitors from around the country have become accustomed to. Congress also plainly intended the ONSR to have recreational value. During the recent open houses hosted by the National Park Service, I witnessed a number of local citizens voicing concerns over what they perceived as a loss of these values under Alternative B, particularly with respect to motorboating on the rivers. However, Alternative B only prohibits motorboats on two stretches where they are currently allowed, and have been since 1984. Even Alternative C, which is designed to give the most latitude to recreational values, closes portions of the very same stretches to motorboats. The NPS' expertise in managing national parks should be given significant deference, and this action will allow the agency to update the management of the rivers for current and expected future recreational use while working to prevent degradation of the waters.

While a number of complaints about restrictions on motorboats have been voiced, Alternative B advances the "use and enjoyment" of visitors by continuing to allow widespread non-motored boating, of particular historical value to these "float" rivers. Furthermore, Alternative B will attempt to continue the 60/40 hp rule as it has been understood in the ONSR, which may result in further rulemaking. Other alternatives would have instituted greater restrictions, so Alternative B takes these interests into account as well.

In order to continue to work in good faith with locals, NPS should consider reinstating the commission of Section 7 of the Enabling Act for the ONSR. The ONSR is preserved for "the people of the United States," but Missourians, particularly those who live near the protected rivers, acutely feel the effects of any proposed change. Giving local men and women the opportunity to serve as members of a committee to the NPS would go a long way towards engendering good faith and comity within the community.

Finally, the Wilderness Plan should be pursued. Most of the pushback during the NPS open houses appeared to be based on misinformation, so increased public education opportunities should be explored. The area slated for wilderness designation under Alternative B is already being managed as a wilderness area for all intents and purposes, and the closure of a single road that is currently NPS-use only will have essentially zero impact on the community. Though it appears that local lawmakers are not prepared to support the plan, moving now at least plants



the seeds for the area to be granted wilderness designation in the near future. Of historical note, the ONSR plans began to be proposed to Congress in 1960, but the ONSR Act was not passed until 1964. This wilderness area may experience a similar delay, but it is a worthwhile endeavor.

The ONSR is a national treasure, and Alternative B to the GMP provides a roadmap to protecting this treasure for future generations while allowing for appropriate and adequate levels of contemporary recreational use. It was a pleasure to visit the community and take part in the NPS' open houses and hearings, and I look forward to returning.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2756 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 20:18:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Ozark National Scenic Riverways preserves the free-flowing Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, the surrounding resources, and the unique cultural heritage of the Ozark people. I copied this exactly from one of the pages on this website. Note the it says PRESERVES the free-flowing Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, the surrounding resources, and the UNIQUE CULTURAL HERITAGE OF THE OZARK PEOPLE. Now everything that is included in this Alternative B (NPS Preferred) plan does not benefit the Ozark Person in one single way. The whole plan is based on what the extreme environmentalist want and I will state again that there is not a single section of the General Management Plan that benefits or helps the Ozark People(locals). You are violating your own mission. Does this make any sense to you because it sure does not to me. Rethink your plan because this Alternative B goes against the very Park Service Mission.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2757 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 20:19:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Ozark National Scenic Riverways preserves the free-flowing Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, the surrounding resources, and the unique cultural heritage of the Ozark people. I copied this exactly from one of the pages on this website. Note the it says PRESERVES the free-flowing Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, the surrounding resources, and the UNIQUE CULTURAL HERITAGE OF THE OZARK PEOPLE. Now everything that is included in this Alternative B (NPS Preferred) plan does not benefit the Ozark Person in one single way. The whole plan is based on what the extreme environmentalist want and I will state again that there is not a single section of the General Management Plan that benefits or helps the Ozark People(locals). You are violating your own mission. Does this make any sense to you because it sure does not to me. Rethink your plan because this Alternative B goes against the very Park Service Mission.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2758 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 20:22:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Alternative B with the exception of restricting power boats during the off season period. Boats with motors could continue using the upper parts of the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers. They should follow the original horse power restrictions with no adjustment for jet driven motors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2759 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 20:34:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the Federal Government designing and implementing a management plan. I have witnessed too many instances of heedless people behaving as to degrade the conditions that make the National Scenic Riverways a national treasure. I understand there is much resentment from some local people to the Federal Government based on past practices. Their concerns should certainly be considered, but their level of outrage should not be correlated with the reasonableness of their demands. Much of their complaints are not based on correct facts. It may be difficult to reduce their complaints through education, but that should not be a reason to give in to their unwarranted complaints. The traditional methods of gigging can be practiced on much of the river without degrading the Riverways, but the upper parts of the river should be protected from motors. The negative impacts, both visual and ecological, of unapproved access points are clear. These access points should be closed. There are many places to enjoy motorized watercraft. There are few places to enjoy a near wilderness float.

I appreciated your efforts to reach out to all stake holders.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2760    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 20:35:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As I understand, Ozark National Scenic Riverways is scenic riverway and not a full National Park. As the name is not 'Ozark National Scenic Riverways National Park'. The National Park Service oversees and assists in the management of the Riverways. Ozark is special in our enabling enactment to allow or not allow all of the same things as a National Park. I feel that some of the employees as well as special interest groups get confused because of this.

#### Motor Boats and HP limits:

I feel the 40/60 hp should be allowed on both the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. Why put limits on parts of the river that is self limiting due to the water levels and heavier canoe use. Responsible boaters will avoid these situations. Educating and setting standards of behavior on the rivers could reduce problems. Having boats in these areas provide rescue potential for canoeist. Motor boaters have assisted in recovering canoes from under root wads and transported ill and injured individuals to safety or a landing for further medical attention. The majority of the boaters are responsible and courteous just enjoying the river. Although, there are the few whose behavior is neither responsible nor courteous. By limiting motor boating in certain areas of the river is discriminating against the elderly, disabled and handicapped that are unable to canoe or kayak. The boat is the safest way for these folks to see and enjoy these areas.

#### Camping:

Instead of limiting the amount of primitive camping accessible by land, add more areas for RV camping. Not everyone that enjoys camping wants to canoe or sleep in a tent, but like to be near the water and or near their motor boat. Boaters enjoy the camping experience and many have RV's. With adding more campsites, the sites will be less crowded and the wear and tear would be spread out and not as concentrated in a few areas. This in return would increase access points to the river. Primitive RV camping for the handicapped and disabled would enhance the experience and add safety. More camping for horse riders should be provided. Not all riders like to go home at the end of the day. They enjoy the experience of on-the-trail camping.

#### Recreation:

My understanding is that the state of Missouri wanted to enhance recreation in the lands obtained by the National Park Service. Adding more horse trails, like adding camp areas, would spread use and each trail would sustain less abuse. By limiting the trails, all the usage is on a few trails causing extensive damage instead of spreading out the usage and limiting the damage. To enjoy the horse ride experience, one likes to be on a trail not a ditch or feel like they are on a street.

Permit concessioners to provide John boat tours. This would be an excellent educational opportunity on the history of the river. This would provide another avenue for non-canoeist to enjoy the river.

#### History:

To preserve and conserve the historical culture of this area, some of the former landmarks such as the Welch hospital and the Round Spring Lodge should be restored. Not as familiar with the other areas, other restorations can be made to enhance their history as well. These sites should be accessible for the elderly, disabled and handicapped. To further preserve the culture of this area, I feel that old farm lands be restored to the way they were in 1968. The roads should be opened and maintained as they were in 1968. As mandated in the enactment, the present park does not reflect the culture of the area. The CCC era has gained a lot of attention and it was a government project. The local culture has been lost of how the people lived and survived here in this part of the Ozarks. Farms were burned down and eliminated. Fields were allowed to grow up in brush, hiding the cultivated and farmed fields carved out with work horses or by hand. The buildings that were deemed good enough to keep has been since became ruins or barely stabilized. Many have now been completely destroyed and removed. What is left to reflect the historical culture of this area?

#### Road to recovery:

In the beginning of Ozark National Scenic Riverways, a commission of individuals appointed by the NPS, Communities and the State Governor to help shape and direct the NPS. My suggestion would be to bring a similar

group back to provide recommendations, guidance and input to general operations of the park.

In closing, I feel that Ozark National Scenic Riverways has a lot of potential to fulfill the preservation of local culture, conservation of resource and provide recreation as mandated. Instead of limiting activities, enhance the opportunities to do all. I, along with many others that have grown up here, love this area. Most do not want to destroy it.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2761    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 20:36:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To the National Park Service  
Re: DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN for the OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS  
From: Diana L. Gray, private citizen of Missouri, naturalist

First, I wish to thank you for inviting public comment on your proposed management plans for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

My husband and I moved to St. Louis from northern IL in 1982. I come to train in my chosen medical field at Washington University/Barnes-Jewish Medical Center. My husband first worked for the Missouri Pacific Railroad when we arrived. He now is a professor of business at St. Louis University. We have always loved the natural world and have thus enjoyed wilderness areas for hiking, camping, skiing (both cross-country & alpine) and reflection.

I first learned of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways from my husband's PhD advisor at the University of Illinois who had taken his 4 children on a 7 day float trip on the Current River around 1980. I was surprised that they would come to Missouri for such a vacation experience. I was surprised to learn there was such a National Park in Missouri. My experience with Midwestern rivers was that they were murky with muddy bottoms and dangerous currents. With that vision in mind, I couldn't imagine the attraction to canoe a Missouri stream for a week, therefore. Was I in for a pleasant surprise!

The first summer we lived in Missouri, we decided we had best check out this Ozark "floating" experience that so many of our new acquaintances seemed to enjoy. We arrived at Akers Ferry and rented a canoe for the upper Current. I was overwhelmed with the beauty of the area, and in particular the clarity of the cold spring-fed stream. There were few people on the Current the first time we canoed it. It was a most memorable experience. We returned time and again and eventually took our extended families on long weekend float trips and camped in the state parks. We fell in love with the Ozark National Scenic Riverways - -- so different from my imagined vision of the Missouri "Ozarks" with friends' descriptions of the Lake of the Ozarks as my past reference point.

We have so enjoyed the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers (mainly the Current) over our 30 years of living in Missouri, but we have become concerned with degradation of the environment in and around the rivers in the last 15 years or so. We are very concerned about the overuse of the area by people, motorized boats & vehicular traffic and particularly ATV and horse use in and around the streams.

I support the NPS option which best protects the natural scenic beauty and water quality while allowing low-impact recreation on the rivers. If some of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways could be designated as Wilderness while allowing low-impact recreation...so much the better. It seems Option B (2) may be the option which best protects the natural environment and water quality while allowing for low-impact recreational use.

Please protect this scenic treasure as a natural resource for reflective recreation for generations to come. I don't believe we can continue to allow ATV's, horses, and overuse by humans if we are going to preserve these free-flowing, clean streams. Once degraded, these streams may never be returned to their natural pristine states.

I wish you the best for wise decision making.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2762    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 20:36:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I feel that the changes the Park Services is trying make is taking away the heritage and culture that has been passed on for years in the Ozarks. They are taking away the rights of the people that live here and directing the park in a way that will destroy the lives of the people and businesses of the Ozarks National Scenic Riverways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2763 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 20:38:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Trails: Current hiking and horse trails should remain in present locations with more emphasis by NPS and trail users on maintaining trail surfaces and erosion control. Trail users should be held responsible for doing their part and be fined for littering. The Park should foster better relations with trail users (cooperative maintenance) and involve all users in any future planning processes. All current and traditional river crossings should remain as presently being used. Outboard Motors: Current regulations and motor size restrictions are presently more stringent than necessary. River depth and natural obstructions have always been the self-limiting factors as to motorized watercraft. I would recommend no change to present policy. Cultural Interpretive Demonstrations: In addition to current cultural demonstrations, the Park should strive to re-implement the previous demonstrations of whiskey making, blacksmithing and sorghum making. These traditional native activities were extremely popular with the visiting public and very educational for area school groups. This would also great more jobs. Water Quality: Park management should be more pro-active in preventing the loss of stream banks, especially in developed areas of the Park. Large amounts of taxpayer monies have been invested in facilities within the river floodplain. One example (there are many) is the loss of stream bank and campsites at the Alley Springs campground, due to neglect and lack of stream bank stabilization. No doubt, one medium (4 to 8 foot rise) flood event per year (usually several) causes more erosion and river sedimentation than all public uses combined, each year.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2764 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Water Quality: Park management should be more pro-active in preventing the loss of stream banks, especially in developed areas of the Park. Large amounts of taxpayer monies have been invested in facilities within the river floodplain. One example (there are many) is the loss of stream bank and campsites at the Alley Springs campground, due to neglect and lack of stream bank stabilization. No doubt, one medium (4 to 8 foot rise) flood event per year (usually several) causes more erosion and river sedimentation than all public uses combined, each year.

Economic Impact: A very important point to consider by NPS in the planning process is the significant negative impact that Alternatives A, B and C will have on the local 6 county area. With tourism being the largest economic contributor in this area (especially Carter and Shannon counties), businesses will suffer and many jobs lost. This geographic area where ONSR is located is considered the most depressed economic area of Missouri, more jobs need to be created, not lost. Park Management needs to, through better relations and cooperation with congressional delegations, obtain an increase in base funding to better maintain Park assets and provide better quality visitor services. Cultural and natural landscapes: As per the 1964 enabling legislation, Park Management is mandated to preserve, protect and manage the natural and cultural resources to the existing mid-1960's appearance and conditions. The Park should make it a priority to better maintain the historical structures, old farmsteads, scenic viewpoints and overall viewsheds. In the 1980's, the Park (for a few years) had an "Open Fields Management Plan" where fields were brushhogged, disced and native grasses sown. With prescribed burning and mechanical means, the traditionally open fields could be returned to the condition and appearance mandated in the legislation.

Roads: All Park roads, traces and accesses, whether Park-owned, county-owned or public roads, should remain open and unimpeded for all park visitor usage. This should include both motorized and non-motorized use. All secondary (non-paved gravel) roads should be maintained on a regular basis with a minimum once-per-year grading of cemetery roads, traditionally prior to Memorial Day each year. With adequate (two-wheel drive) road access, families and cemetery associations will continue to maintain the graves and cemetery grounds. When access roads are not maintained to minimum (regular grading and brush removal) standards, deteriorated conditions severely affects elderly and physically limited visitors from driving to fishing/swimming holes, hunting areas, former family farms and/or other recreation uses.

Trails: Current hiking and horse trails should remain in present locations with more emphasis by NPS and trail users

on maintaining trail surfaces and erosion control. Trail users should be held responsible for doing their part and be fined for littering. The Park should foster better relations with trail users (cooperative maintenance) and involve all users in any future planning processes. All current and traditional river crossings should remain as presently being used.

Outboard Motors: Current regulations and motor size restrictions are presently more stringent than necessary. River depth (shoals) and natural obstructions (root wads) have always been the self-limiting factors as to motorized watercraft. I would recommend no change to present policy.

Cultural Interpretive Demonstrations: In addition to current cultural demonstrations, the Park should strive to re-implement the previous demonstrations of whiskey making, blacksmithing and sorghum making. These traditional native activities were extremely popular with the visiting public and very educational for area school groups. In turn, this would create more jobs.

I strongly favor the "No Action Alternative" to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2765    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 20:44:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for considering opening the trails of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to mountain biking. During the nicer months of the year I make a trip to Missouri to mountain bike 2-3 weekends each month. I have hiked several trails in the Ozark Riverways and they are some of the most scenic in the region. By currently not allowing mountain biking on the trails, you are alienating a large group of environmentally conscious outdoor enthusiasts. Opening these trails to mountain biking and making roadways within the park cycling friendly would be an amazing gift to the cyclists in the region. Please open the trails to mountain biking.

Thank you,  
Eli Molloy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2766    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 20:46:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My father dreamed of taking me and my brothers to float on the Current River. He died before he could do that, but I've enjoyed these rivers for 40 years and have introduced my sons and daughter to the beauty of this area.

As Americans, what we do better than anybody is to protect our natural resources. The scenic riverways are in danger and changes are needed if my kids are to be able to do what my father wanted to do and what I have done. My wife was born and raised in these Ozark watersheds and I have great love and respect for the people living in this area and the river activities that are part of the local culture.

Alternative B is a well reasoned plan that protects the riverways and considers diverse use of this incredible gift.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2767    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cultural and natural landscapes: As per the 1964 enabling legislation, Park Management is mandated to preserve, protect and manage the natural and cultural resources to the existing mid-1960's appearance and conditions. The Park should make it a priority to better maintain the historical structures, old farmsteads, scenic viewpoints and overall view sheds. In the 1980's, the Park (for a few years) had an "Open Fields Management Plan" where fields were brush hogged, disced and native grasses sown. With prescribed burning and mechanical means, the traditionally open fields could be returned to their previous condition and appearance mandated in the legislation.

Roads: All Park roads, traces and accesses, whether Park-owned, county-owned or public roads, should remain open and unimpeded for all park visitor usage. This should include both motorized and non-motorized use. All secondary (non-paved gravel) roads should be maintained on a regular basis with a minimum once-per-year grading of cemetery roads, traditionally prior to Memorial Day each year. With adequate (two-wheel drive) road access, families and cemetery associations will continue to be responsible for the graves and cemetery grounds. When access roads are not maintained to minimum (regular grading and brush removal) standards, deteriorated conditions severely affects elderly and physically limited visitors from driving to fishing/swimming holes, hunting areas,

former family farms and/or other recreation uses. Trails: Current hiking and horse trails should remain in present locations with more emphasis by NPS and trail users on maintaining trail surfaces and erosion control. Trail users should be held responsible for doing their part and be fined for littering. The Park should strive to develop better relations with trail users (cooperative maintenance) and involve all users in any future planning processes. All current and traditional river crossings should remain as presently being used. Outboard Motors: Current regulations and motor size restrictions are presently more stringent than necessary. River depth and natural obstructions have always been the self-limiting factors as to motorized watercraft. I would recommend no change to present policy. Cultural Interpretive Demonstrations: In addition to current cultural demonstrations, the Park should strive to re-implement the previous demonstrations of whiskey making, blacksmithing and sorghum making. These traditional native activities were extremely popular with the visiting public and very educational for area school groups. Water Quality: Park management should be more pro-active in preventing the loss of stream banks, especially in developed areas of the Park. Large amounts of taxpayer monies have been invested in facilities within the river floodplain. One example is the loss of stream bank and campsites at the Alley Springs campground, due to neglect and lack of stream bank stabilization. Economic Impact: A very important point to consider by NPS in the planning process is the significant negative impact that Alternatives A, B and C will have on the local 6 county area. With tourism being the largest economic contributor in this area (especially Carter and Shannon counties), businesses will suffer and many jobs lost. This geographic area where ONSR is located is considered the most depressed economic area of Missouri, more jobs need to be created, not lost. Park Management needs to, through better relations and cooperation with congressional delegations, obtain an increase in base funding to better maintain Park assets and provide quality visitor services.

I strongly favor the "No Action Alternative" to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2768	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Economic Impact: A very important point to consider by NPS in the planning process is the significant negative impact that Alternatives A, B and C will have on the local 6 county area. With tourism being the largest economic contributor in this area (especially Carter and Shannon counties), businesses will suffer and many jobs lost. This geographic area where ONSR is located is considered the most depressed economic area of Missouri, more jobs need to be created, not lost. Park Management needs to, through better relations and cooperation with congressional delegations, obtain an increase in base funding to better maintain Park assets and provide better quality visitor services.

Trails: Current hiking and horse trails should remain in present locations with more emphasis by NPS and trail users on maintaining trail surfaces and erosion control. Trail users should be held responsible for doing their part and be fined for littering. The Park should foster better relations with trail users (cooperative maintenance) and involve all users in any future planning processes. All current and traditional river crossings should remain as presently being used. Outboard Motors: Current regulations and motor size restrictions are presently more stringent than necessary. River depth (shoals) and natural obstructions (root wads) have always been the self-limiting factors as to motorized watercraft. I would recommend no change to present policy. Roads: All Park roads, traces and accesses, whether Park-owned, county-owned or public roads, should remain open and unimpeded for all park visitor usage. This should include both motorized and non-motorized use. All secondary (non-paved gravel) roads should be maintained on a regular basis with a minimum once-per-year grading of cemetery roads, traditionally prior to Memorial Day each year. With adequate (two-wheel drive) road access, families and cemetery associations will continue to maintain the graves and cemetery grounds. When access roads are not maintained to minimum (regular grading and brush removal) standards, deteriorated conditions severely affects elderly and physically limited visitors from driving to fishing/swimming holes, hunting areas, former family farms and/or other recreation uses.

Cultural Interpretive Demonstrations: In addition to current cultural demonstrations, the Park should strive to re-implement the previous demonstrations of whiskey making, blacksmithing and sorghum making. These traditional native activities were quite well received by the visiting public and very educational for area school groups. In turn, this would create more jobs. Water Quality: Park management should be more pro-active in preventing the loss of stream banks, especially in developed areas of the Park. Large amounts of taxpayer monies have been invested in facilities within the river floodplain. One example (there are many) is the loss of stream bank and campsites at the Alley Springs campground, due to neglect and lack of stream bank stabilization. No doubt, one medium (4 to 8 foot rise) flood event per year (usually several) causes more erosion and river sedimentation than all public uses combined, each year. Cultural and natural landscapes: As per the 1964 enabling legislation, Park Management is

mandated to preserve, protect and manage the natural and cultural resources to the existing mid-1960's appearance and conditions. The Park should make it a priority to better maintain the historical structures, old farmsteads, scenic viewpoints and overall viewsheds. In the 1980's, the Park (for a few years) had an "Open Fields Management Plan" where fields were brush hogged, disced and native grasses sown. With prescribed burning and mechanical means, the traditionally open fields could be returned to the condition and appearance mandated in the legislation.

I strongly favor the "No Action Alternative" to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2769    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Economic Impact: A very important point to consider by NPS in the planning process is the significant negative impact that Alternatives A, B and C will have on the local 6 county area. With tourism being the largest economic contributor in this area (especially Carter and Shannon counties), businesses will suffer and many jobs lost. This geographic area where ONSR is located is considered the most depressed economic area of Missouri, more jobs need to be created, not lost. Park Management needs to, through better relations and cooperation with congressional delegations, obtain an increase in base funding to better maintain Park assets and provide better quality visitor services. Trails: Current hiking and horse trails should remain in present locations with more emphasis by NPS and trail users on maintaining trail surfaces and erosion control. Trail users should be held responsible for doing their part and be fined for littering. The Park should foster better relations with trail users (cooperative maintenance) and involve all users in any future planning processes. All current and traditional river crossings should remain as presently being used. Outboard Motors: Current regulations and motor size restrictions are presently more stringent than necessary. River depth (shoals) and natural obstructions (root wads) have always been the self-limiting factors as to motorized watercraft. I would recommend no change to present policy. Roads: All Park roads, traces and accesses, whether Park-owned, county-owned or public roads, should remain open and unimpeded for all park visitor usage. This should include both motorized and non-motorized use. All secondary (non-paved gravel) roads should be maintained on a regular basis with a minimum once-per-year grading of cemetery roads, traditionally prior to Memorial Day each year. With adequate (two-wheel drive) road access, families and cemetery associations will continue to maintain the graves and cemetery grounds. When access roads are not maintained to minimum (regular grading and brush removal) standards, deteriorated conditions severely affects elderly and physically limited visitors from driving to fishing/swimming holes, hunting areas, former family farms and/or other recreation uses. Cultural Interpretive Demonstrations: In addition to current cultural demonstrations, the Park should strive to re-implement the previous demonstrations of whiskey making, blacksmithing and sorghum making. These traditional native activities were quite well received by the visiting public and very educational for area school groups. In turn, this would create more jobs. Water Quality: Park management should be more pro-active in preventing the loss of stream banks, especially in developed areas of the Park. Large amounts of taxpayer monies have been invested in facilities within the river floodplain. One example (there are many) is the loss of stream bank and campsites at the Alley Springs campground, due to neglect and lack of stream bank stabilization. No doubt, one medium (4 to 8 foot rise) flood event per year (usually several) causes more erosion and river sedimentation than all public uses combined, each year. Cultural and natural landscapes: As per the 1964 enabling legislation, Park Management is mandated to preserve, protect and manage the natural and cultural resources to the existing mid-1960's appearance and conditions. The Park should make it a priority to better maintain the historical structures, old farmsteads, scenic viewpoints and overall viewsheds. In the 1980's, the Park (for a few years) had an "Open Fields Management Plan" where fields were brushhogged, disced and native grasses sown. With prescribed burning and mechanical means, the traditionally open fields could be returned to the condition and appearance mandated in the legislation.

I strongly favor the "No Action Alternative" to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2770    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 20:56:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alternative Plan B.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2771    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Cultural Interpretive Demonstrations: In addition to current cultural demonstrations, the Park should strive to re-implement the previous demonstrations of whiskey making, blacksmithing and sorghum making. These traditional native activities were quite well received by the visiting public and very educational for area school groups. In turn, this would create more jobs. Economic Impact: A very important point to consider by NPS in the planning process is the monumental negative impact that Alternatives A, B and C will have on the local 6 county area. With tourism being the largest economic contributor in this area (especially Carter and Shannon counties), businesses will suffer and many jobs lost. This geographic area where ONSR is located is considered the most depressed economic area of Missouri, more jobs need to be created, not lost. Park Management needs to, through better relations and cooperation with congressional delegations, obtain an increase in base funding to better maintain Park assets and provide better quality visitor services.

Roads: All Park roads, traces and accesses, whether Park-owned, county-owned or public roads, should remain open and unimpeded for all park visitor usage. This should include both motorized and non-motorized use. All secondary (non-paved gravel) roads should be maintained on a regular basis with a minimum once-per-year grading of cemetery roads, traditionally prior to Memorial Day each year. With adequate (two-wheel drive) road access, families and cemetery associations will continue to maintain the graves and cemetery grounds. When access roads are not maintained to minimum (regular grading and brush removal) standards, deteriorated conditions severely affects elderly and physically limited visitors from driving to fishing/swimming holes, hunting areas, former family farms and/or other recreation uses. Trails: Current hiking and horse trails should remain in present locations with more emphasis by NPS and trail users on maintaining trail surfaces and erosion control. Trail users should be held responsible for doing their part and be fined for littering. The Park should foster better relations with trail users (cooperative maintenance) and involve all users in any future planning processes. All current and traditional river crossings should remain as presently being used. Water Quality: Park management should be more pro-active in preventing the loss of stream banks, especially in developed areas of the Park. Large amounts of taxpayer monies have been invested in facilities within the river floodplain. One example (there are many) is the loss of stream bank and campsites at the Alley Springs campground, due to neglect and lack of stream bank stabilization. No doubt, one medium (4 to 8 foot rise) flood event per year (usually several) causes more erosion and river sedimentation than all public uses combined, each year. Outboard Motors: Current regulations and motor size restrictions are presently more stringent than necessary. River depth (shoals) and natural obstructions (root wads) have always been the self-limiting factors as to motorized watercraft. I would recommend no change to present policy. Cultural and natural landscapes: As per the 1964 enabling legislation, Park Management is mandated to preserve, protect and manage the natural and cultural resources to the existing mid-1960's appearance and conditions. The Park should make it a priority to better maintain the historical structures, old farmsteads, scenic viewpoints and overall viewsheds. In the 1980's, the Park (for a few years) had an "Open Fields Management Plan" where fields were brush hogged, disced and native grasses sown. With prescribed burning and mechanical means, the traditionally open fields could be returned to the condition and appearance mandated in the legislation.

I strongly favor the "No Action Alternative" to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2772 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 20:59:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Alternative Plan B.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2773 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 21:03:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please take the action necessary to keep our Ozark National Scenic Riverways clean and safe for everyone to enjoy in the manner that is appropriate to maintain and safeguard it's fragile, natural qualities! I have very fond memories of floating and camping those Riverways - enjoying the beauty and quiet, serene environment - back in the day when folks had respect for and showed common courtesies to their fellow humans as well as the flora and fauna. While enjoying and appreciating the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers we had a sense of responsibility to leave it as we found it so that those that followed could also enjoy the pristine qualities of that treasure the ONSR. And we also understood the responsibility of taking care of the environment so that it would remain intact and even flourish in it's natural state - 'leave no trace'. We have so very few 'Places' where we can go and make the connection with our natural environment - refreshing our spirits! I believe we were issued a Divine Directive to oversee and



take care of the earth, flora, fauna and each other - NOT to dishonor, degrade and pillage our earthly home that supports and provides for us and our fellow living beings! I was born and grew up, living many years near the ONSR and it is still home in my heart!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2774    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 21:05:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** National Park Superintendent  
Ozarks National Scenic Riverways  
Comments on the proposed:  
General Management Plan & Wilderness Study

First I would like to thank the NPS for the tremendous amount of work required in preparation of the submitted plans. The Parks choice of plan "B" has some worthy aspects but I would prefer a more protective choice as in plan "A".

The following is a brief list of what I would like the Park Service to consider.

- 1) Close old access roads and old logging roads which lead to gravel bars or parallel the river. These roads make access to the river easy for users of ATV's, dirt bikes, & 4-wheel drive vehicles.
  - 2) Keep horse trails to a minimum within the park boundary and allow only one or two river crossings. River water quality needs to be maintained to keep e-coli contamination from horse waste (as well as humans) to a minimum.
  - 3) Only allow gravel bar camping by those groups and individuals who access the gravel bars by canoe or boat. Trailer and car/tent camping should be restricted to only Park Service designated "camping only" areas along and within the park boundary.
  - 4) Motor boats sizes and river usage should be limited in both motor size (keep it to a small horsepower) and restrict usage above the Two Rivers area.
- As a personal note, there is nothing more less natural than to hear the high pitch sound of motor boats running up and down the river.
- 5) Establish the area around Big Springs as a Wilderness Area to be enjoyed by all those who choose to go beyond the beaten path.

I have canoe floated both the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers since in early part of the 1960's. Over that time period, I have had many great trip floating these two rivers in both Spring and Summer. Unfortunately I have witnessed the river's misuse such as ATV's on gravel bars and in the river itself, to mention just one. As well as, others who chosen not to respect what a truly natural wonder these two rivers provide to both Missourians and all other visitors to this natural area. It is my hope that we can keep this gem as close to it natural state as possible for all of us to enjoy as well as future generations.

Sincerely your,  
Gary R. Baldwin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2775    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 21:24:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for analyzing problems being experienced by visitors to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and suggesting improvements.

Our family has been visiting, floating and swimming in the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers since the late 1950s. Since the 1980s, and especially in more recent years, we have noticed a marked deterioration in the beauty and natural conditions of the Park. We are glad to find that the Park Service now seems willing to adopt a new management plan that would greatly improve on these conditions.

Adoption and enforcement of Alternative B would significantly improve the experience of visitors who want to enjoy nature in the Park. However, I urge you to adopt Alternative A, because it would best achieve the goals of the legislation that established ONSR and which would best protect the enjoyment of nature within the Park.

For example, Alternative A would:

- close gravel bars to vehicles, thus protecting water quality and reducing erosion;
- remove 50 miles of illegal roads, allowing these illegal roads to return to natural conditions;
- close 65 miles of horse trails that were never part of the Park's official plan; and
- prevent the legalization of new crossings of streams by horses, thus again protecting water quality.

In deliberating on which alternative would best serve both the original purpose of the ONSR and the current visitors to the Park, I would ask you to consider the following principles:

- There should be no motorized traffic (including ATVs) inside the Park except on designated paved roads, because off-road they damage vegetation, scare or destroy wildlife, and ruin quiet enjoyment of nature.
- Speed limits for motorized traffic on designated paved roads should be strictly enforced.
- If ATV owners want a publicly supported riding range (which our family would support), state or local governments should provide an alternative driving range far enough away from any public or private parks or nature reserves that noise from the ATVs isn't audible at the boundary of any existing park or nature reserve. An appropriate location for an ATV range might be an industrial park or next to a highway.
- We believe horses should be allowed within ONSR, because they are quieter, do not scare wildlife and have far less negative impact on vegetation than motorized vehicles. However, because horses can cause turbidity in streams and greatly increase e coli levels, they can adversely affect aquatic and human health. Therefore, horses should be kept at all times far enough away from the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and their major tributaries that no measurable negative impact on water quality is found. Thus, horse trails should be designated within the Park, but they should be designed NOT to go through either of the 2 rivers or a major tributary, nor so close along the banks of any of these as to cause erosion or allow run-off to contaminate the rivers or major tributaries.
- ONSR is a federal park funded by the citizens of the United States. ONSR is a nature destination for citizens of the United States. It is not a local park whose purpose is to exclusively serve the recreational desires of the local community. Therefore, although nearby residents may be able to enjoy the benefits of the Park more often than citizens living farther away, the nearby residents should have no greater influence over the Park's management decisions than other citizens of the United States.

Finally, we urge the National Park Service to act as quickly as possible to designate Big Spring for wilderness status, so that its current condition can be preserved.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the alternatives presented in the new Management Plan.

Sincerely,  
Virginia, Charles, Garnet and Fred Blake and Mark Blum  
9932 Litzsinger Road  
St. Louis, Missouri 63124

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2776	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 21:26:21				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** If you choose to close any segment of the Current or Jacks Fork River to motors and use motors for any reason other than a medical emergency you have missed the entire point and have lost all creditability and should turn management responsibility over the the State of Missouri.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2777	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 21:29:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I prefer the "no changes to access" proposal. Local people love and treasure both the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers and have maintained them for generations.

The biggest tragedy in the whole situation is that the federal government has been allowed to acquire any authority. Local control is preferable and more logical.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2778    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 21:30:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

There's little choice give except for alternative B.

You only have to go to the Buffalo River or Jacks Fork to see

what no oversight and money can do and has done to the Current Rive,

at some point the pendulum has got to start it's journey

back to some symbolism of control over the masses every want.

The river has it's limits, do we have to go storming past them

to know what they were and it be too late to make a difference?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2779    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 21:52:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alternative A. Please provide maximum protection for this great resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2780    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 22:00:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This new proposal restricts those who wish to enjoy the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers via boat to certain portions of the river during certain times of the year. Therefore, I support the no new action management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2781    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 22:05:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the no action alternative. I support this option, not because I believe nothing should be done but, because I do not support any of the alternatives presented. I live near the headwaters of the Current River and have enjoyed the river my entire life. I recreate on and around both the Current and Jacks Fork rivers. I enjoy many forms of recreation including floating (canoeing), hiking, horseback riding, and riding in motorized boats. I see all these forms of recreation as a valid parts of historic and current Ozarks culture. All of the alternatives completely restrict jet boats on the upper portions of both rivers. I understand the desire to keep these areas pristine but I do not think that never allowing boats in these areas is the answer. The upper regions of these rivers have relatively low flows that do not allow motorized boats most of the season and when it is possible to take jet boats in these areas it is often difficult if not impossible to enjoy these areas in other ways. If there is enough water to run a jet boat above Cedar Grove next to no one is going to be out floating and as few people will be out hiking. Therefore I think that there should not be further restriction on jet boats on the upper regions of the rivers because the use of jet boats in these areas does not affect other users of the park. I also enjoy floating on the clear, blue waters of the Current and Jacks Fork rivers. But, if I go floating on a Saturday in the summer I do not expect a quiet and peaceful float. I expect other floaters will be out, making noise and having fun, and others will be along the riverbank to swim and enjoy the river. If I want a nice peaceful trip I will go on a weekday during the summer or during the spring or fall. This is a reality of the river that cannot reasonably be

changed. The river is a relatively inexpensive place to recreate and people will enjoy it as they would like to which will continue to involve alcohol and music. I do not wish to take away a type of recreation another enjoys in order to make my particular choice for recreating possible more frequently. Nice calm peaceful days on the river far out weigh rowdy ones but not if your sample size is every Saturday from June through August. I say all that about floating to say that although it is seen as a less obtrusive form of recreation, it is not always unobtrusive. And, I don't believe the NPS has plans to restrict floating.

Hiking is another recreation I enjoy and I completely support the addition of more hiking trails in the ONSR. I believe this is an area that definitely needs development but I do not believe that it should come at the expense of other forms of recreation. I enjoy, jet boating, canoeing, horseback riding, and hiking. I do not want the ONSR to be turned into a hiking and floating park because some believe that those are higher forms of recreation. I also do not believe that an occasional jet boat is any more disruptive than a rowdy group of floaters. And, as previously stated, those rowdy floaters have a right to recreate as they wish and those habits will not be changed.

Finally the form of recreation I'm most passionate about is horseback riding. I love to gather with a small group of friends and explore forgotten paths of the ONSR. I often ride with my father and he tells me stories of his experiences on the trails we ride, the past landowners, and my relatives that once lived along the river. I am able to connect with the past by traveling the paths that used to be frequented by Ozarkians but are now scarcely used because they are not accessible. I love to come upon old house sites and imagine what the area might have looked like to my great grandfather when he delivered the mail, or what the route traveled looked like to my great grandmother who traveled by horseback to teach school. I know many others do not have the same attachments I do but I believe this point of view is still interesting to many people.

Some may say that hiking can provide the same experiences as horseback riding with less negative impact, but I challenge that person to cover twenty miles in one day on foot. Horseback riding provides its own unique perspective and experience and I do not think it is one that should be excluded from any part of the ONSR. I understand the negative impact that has been measured in the form of elevated e. coli levels in the river. I do not think that large groups of riders should allow their horses to stand and defecate in the river. But, I think that improved management could easily eliminate this problem.

I agree that trails and crossings for horse use should be designated but I do not trust the park to form and designate these trails without restricting access to important areas. I enjoy traveling down the old roads used by locals for years and see no reason why they could not be designated as trails. But in many instances the where an old road existed the park has decided to close them off and instead cut out a path through brush. So while I agree that trails and crossings need to be designated I would like to see a multidisciplinary team comprised of scientists, park officials, and riders work together to determine where these trails should be and the path they should follow. Of course I will not agree with all the choices made by even the best possible team but I understand that compromises must be made and I believe decisions made by a team would lead to better compromises.

In summary, I appreciate and enjoy many forms of recreation in the ONSR and wish to continue to enjoy these activities in the future. I understand that to continue to enjoy these things some management changes need to be made, but I do not agree with the proposed plans provided. I do not think there is any benefit to banning motorized boats in the upper regions of the river. I do not think that motorized boats cause any more disturbance than a typical group of floaters on a Saturday in the summer. I do think more trails should be formed and developed for hiking and horseback riding in the ONSR. I do not want the NPS to determine what trails and crossings will be used without input from trail users and other experts. Overall I think people are entitled to recreate in the manner they choose within reason. No one should encroach upon another's rights but those that wish for a quiet untouched river way should understand they are encroaching on another's right when they lobby to outlaw their form of recreation. My hope is that the park service will seriously consider the comments given and do a thorough revision of whatever alternative they choose before forming a new General Management Plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2782    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 22:07:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe that there should be more regulation. I enjoy the streams and believe more action needs to take place in protecting them. I'm also willing to accept the regulations myself. If that means hiking more from a point away from many of the abused access points, than so be it. It is sad to hear that pollution in the streams has reached dangerous levels. There are consequences when introducing great numbers of non native animals into a concentrated area of the stream all at once. If it were up to me, I would completely outlaw all atv's on the ONSR property. The days of free for all family atv gatherings on the rivers should end.

A friend and I had an unnerving experience while floating the Current River. Three guys on horseback decided to go

right through our camp within minutes of us setting up for our overnight float. It made absolutely no sense to us. There was plenty of room for them to get around us elsewhere. They went into the woods and turned back around and stomped right through our camp again! They didn't say anything and stared us down the whole time. We would have said something but they were all holstered with guns! I definitely think there is some sort of resentment from some of the horseback riders.

My vote would be for proposal B. The video from the "Friends of the Riverways" site opened my eyes to how much people have impacted the Riverways. The river doesn't need that many access points. I personally feel that there are bigger bodies of water better suited for John Boats. Not the Riverways.

I've witnessed many creeks degrade while growing up. Creeks that were doomed because of how land was zoned within their watersheds. The urban sprawl reaching out of St. Louis made this happen rapidly. There is hope for the riverways. The ONSR needs to keep the rivers in better check for future generations to enjoy. I feel like examples of clean flowing streams in beautiful areas are dwindling and the implementation of what's better for conservation is key. If this proposal goes through, and does reach many of its goals, a possible example can be made for other struggling rivers worth more protection.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2783	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 22:14:37
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	It is unnecessary for additional restrictions to be placed on horseback riding on the Jacks Fork and Current River, and trails in the surrounding areas. Vacationing horse enthusiasts and trail riders bring significant revenue to our local economy. Further limitations and restrictions on trail riding will have a negative economic impact. I support the no new action management plan.
------------------------	---

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2784	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 22:14:40
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Sir,
------------------------	-----------

I really appreciate the National Park Service work to save a bit of the natural History of Missouri for myself and our future generations of Americans.

I am 65 years old and currently am employed as a Fire Captain for the Jefferson City Fire Department. I have lived my life in Missouri.

I would prefer that our use and appreciation of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways would not change the nature of what we are trying to save for our use and appreciation.

I would be in favor of restricting the use of this park that would cause damage to it. I know that the use of 4-wheelers causes physical damage to the parks structure. These vehicles also bring in invasive species. These invasives like Scericia Lespadesa, Japanese Honeysuckle, Autumn Olive, Bush Honeysuckle, Winter Creeper, etc., will eventually displace our natural flora. Also driving these vehicle through waterways also causes damage to the aquatic life.

I have seen that some woodlands in the Jefferson City have been completely taken over by invasives, because of nearby ornamental plantings. This will eventually happen to our Ozarks.

The use of horses in the park may be less damaging, but they will still bring in some invasive seeds and cuttings.

I also don't believe that firearms should be used in the Park.

I appreciate your consideration of my comments.

Charles Skornia

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2785	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 22:22:41
------------------	----------------------

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Comments on final draft General Management plan Feb 7 2014

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the General Management Plan for the ONSR. These comments are on behalf of the Missouri Chapter of the Sierra Club representing over 8300 members in the state of Missouri. Our members are committed to the enjoyment, protection and exploration of our natural heritage. The ONSR is a treasured resource for the whole county, and a very special place for Missourians.

Our members have enjoyed and explored the ONSR as children, as adults, as parents with children and in our senior years. Our membership includes those live in the ONSR area, some are landowners. But like the state population itself, many of our members live farther away. We cherish our opportunities to visit and refresh our lives with a float, hike or horseback ride in ONSR.

The ONSR needs a revised GMP and we appreciate the work the NPS has put into preparing the final draft alternatives. The agency has done a good job of presenting alternatives with a range of approaches to balancing the need for preservation and protection with the desire for varied recreation now. That balance is at the heart of the park's mission, but with an eye towards the fundamental mission of the park and future generations, protection and preservation should be foremost. That perspective also ensures a quality environment for current users. Without this view we would not have the resource valued today. Users count on the Current and Jacks Fork rivers to provide clean and clear recreational waters.

We support Alternative A, which we view as providing the best protection for natural and cultural resources while offering varied recreational opportunities. A summary of some points of value are:

1.Closing unauthorized trails/roads and access points. Unauthorized river access points increase erosion and sediment load, enable motorized access to gravel bars which is harmful to other users and the environment, mar the view from land and water, and may increase user numbers in times and areas where restraint is needed Unauthorized trails and roads do much the same and in addition enable illegal motorized and horse use . We support the commitment in A to closing such access points, roads and trails.

2.Relocating trails and crossings, adding trails. We support the plan to look at existing planned trails and assess their impacts with a promise to relocate trails in more environmentally appropriate routes. This is especially important for horse riding trails. We also encourage development of more hiking trails. The park's 1991 road assessment clearly pointed out the need to address the proliferation of unauthorized trails/roads with closures and the benefit of updating the planned trail system.

3.Horseback riding: We support horseback riding in the ONSR. But in addition to considering horse trail mileage and location, the issues of numbers of riders and stream crossing require special consideration. Clean water is one of the most outstanding resources visitors will appreciate in ONSR. We encounter so many polluted and compromised waters that freely enjoying clean streams is a special encounter. Eroded areas, humans, vehicles and horses all contribute some pollution risk. But horses and poorly placed horse trails and stream crossings are the greatest risk. Part of this issue is pure numbers. We recommend the agency take action as needed to limit numbers based on resource conditions and limitations. Horse camping within the ONSR would strain the resource and be difficult to manage. Options for horse camping outside the park could be an option for the local economy.

4.Motorized river use. We support the park's plan to accommodate the plan with current motorboat 60/40 requirements and standards. The character of the rivers historically have made some of the reaches difficult if not inaccessible to motorized crafts. But changes in technology have enabled motorized crafts to travel further. It is appropriate that the agency assess this new capability and evaluate natural resource impacts, user patterns and the overall park mission in that light. But for rivers like the Current and Jacks Fork which are so highly used by non-motorized crafts, it makes sense to dedicate some segments off limits to motorized crafts.

5.Cultural resources: Appreciation of the history and culture of human activity in the ONSR is an important part any park experience. We support educational efforts with restoration and protection of historic sites. We caution that restoration of fields/pasture like landscapes be closely kept to the immediate viewshed of any restored homestead

etc. Bottomlands forests are an important but relatively rare part of the ONSR area ecology. These forests should not be transitioned to open areas except in rare circumstances, such as restoration of a limited landscape homestead site.

6.Wilderness: A Wilderness area would provide an attractive addition to the ONSR. We understand that the recommendation in the GMP is not a legislative determination of Wilderness. But the agency's recognition of wilderness characteristics of the Big Spring tract will ensure managing the area as wild and rustic and thus provide visitors with a unique experience. We support the agency's assessment of a potential wilderness area as found in alternative A or B.

7.Scenic Easements: Although not mentioned directly in the GMP alternatives, proficient management of scenic and conservation easements are important to enhancing the ONSR user experience. Such easements are a legal contract and we are pleased to hear of the agency's intent to work with landowners to keep compliance up to date.

8.Species protection: As the agency carries out whatever alternative is implemented we support careful attention to the needs of flora and fauna of the park. The park is an important riparian corridor providing habitat, refuge and migration routes for many Missouri species. Given the unknown specific stresses on species due to climate change this corridor will gain greater value

9.Local community and economy: The ONSR is a national park of value to and supported through taxes by all citizens. It provides economic value to the local economy and brings in money from outside the area. The natural resource protections and recreational opportunities evaluated and balanced in the plan alternatives are needed to keep the quality of the park attractive to visitors from afar and nearby. Another variable is park staffing and the ability to manage and monitor the park. More intensive recreation that risks resource impairment requires more staff to try to avoid damage, if that is even possible. We view alternative C especially as overreaching in keeping that balance between protection and use.

The park and local communities will benefit if the ONSR keeps a solid, deserved reputation as a well managed park with clean waters and natural surroundings inviting a variety of low impact recreation. Nearby communities will also benefit as they offer the amenities the park itself cannot provide.

Again, we are impressed with the work and detail that went into the development of the GMP draft. Since the ONSR has not had a plan revision since 1984 this has been a daunting task. We look forward to the NPS's decision on the GMP. And we look forward to continuing to enjoy, explore and help protect the Current and Jacks Fork river area.

Thank you for consideration of our comments.  
Sierra Club, Missouri chapter,  
7164 Manchester Ave., Maplewood, MO 63143  
Caroline Pufalt, Conservation chair

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2786    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 22:30:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Alternative A seems like the optimal care-taking of the Current and Jacks Fork waterways. As I reflect back on my youth upon these rivers, when my parents took us canoeing every year from 1986, continuing on, we observed a great deal. Never underestimate the destructiveness of inebriated young people is one big lesson. Any experience of wildlife, serenity, or family bonding can be shattered by screaming drunks with loud music, vehicles, and copious trash containers spilling everywhere unattended. Such people are having a great time- -and disregarding \*everything\* of laws, courtesy, or well-being of others, wildlife, etc. Stop the illegal roads and the gravel-bar access- -it only opens up more territory to the sense of unfettered lawlessness and irresponsibility that makes everyone else pay a higher price for the experience of the exploitative few. Big Spring needs to be a wilderness designation. The human traffic is already an intense burden upon the place, let alone opening it up to other angles of use. Please keep as much motor-boat traffic OFF the rivers as possible; the disturbance level of every aspect- -to canoeists, wildlife, campers, etc.- -is simply not worth indulging the few who would wish to use such. Please do all you can to reduce erosion, to protect water quality, to defend the distinctive wildlife and scenic character of these magical and unique riverways. As the population continues to rise, treasures like these feel ever-greater pressure, and deserve ever-vigilant care. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2787    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Comments and Recommendations regarding the  
Draft General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement for  
Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Missouri, dated October 2013

Submitted by Eric Dannenmaier  
Professor of Law  
Director, Environmental and Natural Resources Law  
Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law  
February 7, 2014

## BACKGROUND AND BASIS OF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I am a Missouri native and a lifelong visitor to and recreational user of the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers. My personal connection to and interest in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) extends back to a time before Congress voted to create the ONSR. My parents honeymooned along the Jacks Fork River, in what is now the ONSR, at a retreat operated by the Missouri State Teachers Association about 14 miles Northeast of Mountain View, Missouri. I keep in my home a black and white snapshot of my mother, a new bride, standing in front of a cabin overlooking the Jacks Fork in the 1950s.

I grew up visiting the Jacks Fork, the Current, the Eleven Point, and other Southern Missouri rivers from our home in St. Louis, and later Springfield, Missouri. As a child, and later a high school and college student, I swam and waded in - and camped, canoed, and fished along the banks of - these unique rivers. I also hiked the woods of the Mark Twain National Forest and other protected, scenic, conservation, and wilderness areas managed by the federal and state governments throughout the region. I left Missouri after college, and my work has not allowed me to return as a resident. But my love for the region, and for the rivers and landscape that comprise the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, has made me a frequent visitor.

A few years ago I did manage to return to the region to become a property owner. I purchased about six acres of forested land on a bluff overlooking the Jacks Fork. The land is at the Eastern edge of the Eminence gap, where private property remains outside the direct protection of the legal framework for the Riverways, but where the value of the land is increased and sustained by the existence of the ONSR and the protection that its conservation affords.

I am also a law professor who researches and teaches environmental, natural resources, and water law. As part of my work, I have spent over two decades analyzing and teaching legal frameworks for water resources protection, and advising governments and stakeholders on strengthening rules for the conservation of those resources. My work focuses both on the substance of conservation law, and on the process of stakeholder access to natural resource decision-making and the resources that are protected by conservation regimes.

Through my work and my own volition, I have been fortunate to travel in all 48 states of the lower continental United States, and in over 50 countries around the world. These travels have revealed many incredible landscapes and exceptional rivers, but I have found no river that surpasses the natural beauty or intrinsic value of the Jacks Fork or the Current. A well-known American Supreme Court Justice, Oliver Wendell Holmes, once wrote that A river is more than an amenity - it is a treasure that offers a necessity of life that must be rationed among those who have the power over it. (New Jersey v. New York, 283 U.S. 336, 342 (1931)). For me, and for many who have experienced them, the Current and the Jacks Fork are national treasures. I understand why Congress decided, on voice votes in both houses for which I have found no recorded opposition, to establish the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. (The authorizing legislation (S 16) was passed by voice votes of the Senate Oct. 22, 1963, and of the House Aug. 11, 1964. The Senate Aug. 14 agreed to the House amendments, and the President signed S 16 into law Aug. 27 (PL 88-492). See Congressional Quarterly Almanac 1964, available at <http://firststreet.cqpress.com/cqalmanac/document.php?id=cqal64-1303164&type=toc&num=9>)

I am grateful that the National Park Service (NPS) is updating its blueprint for conserving the ONSR, and I



recognize the time and painstaking effort that produced the Draft General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement for Ozark National Scenic Riverways (draft GMP). I have reviewed the draft GMP in detail, and I was attended the January 2014 Open Houses and Wilderness Hearings in Van Buren and Kirkwood, Missouri. I have also spoken with many of the residents and business owners in the region about the proposal, and NPS preferred Alternative B, and had time to consider the positions of those who would prefer both more, and less, protection for the ONSR.

It is from this perspective - as a Missouri native; a lifelong visitor to the Jacks Fork and the Current; a riparian property owner along the Jacks Fork; an expert in natural resources and water law and policy; and a person who has taken the time to become familiar with the draft GMP and to consider local residents responses to the draft - that I respectfully offer the following two comments and three recommendations regarding the Draft GMP.

I note at the outset that I understand the NPS preference for Alternative B. I would have sought a greater measure of protection (Alternative A, or perhaps a B ) but I recognize the insights and compromises that would lead to the choice of a plan that seeks to accommodate the demand for access for recreational use within a broader conservation plan. So I support Alternative B, but that support is driven by my respect for the expertise of the NPS and qualified by my belief that any lesser degree of protection would be legally indefensible.

COMMENT ONE: The implementation of the draft GMP (preferred Alternative B) would be facilitated by increased public outreach and greater public engagement in the future management of the ONSR

The process of outreach to members of the public - at least that part I observed at the meetings in Van Buren and Kirkwood, and learned about from others who attended the Open House in Eminence - demonstrated a strong local interest in the ONSR and its management. My discussions with local residents who chose not to comment on the plan in public suggest that local concern about the draft GMP preferred Alternative B may be exaggerated. I believe that these silent or reticent stakeholders raise questions about whether the character of local interest is fairly represented by public feedback on the draft plan. But the fact of strong local interest cannot be denied.

Of course the ONSR is a national resource that must be managed pursuant to the values established by Congress on behalf of the whole American people. It should not, and cannot legally, be managed to satisfy the interests of any one faction of local residents. Yet a management plan that considers local interests, and engages local stakeholders as stewards of the ONSR, is more likely to succeed in its goals. In addition, local residents experience the landscape of a conservation area more immediately and regularly than those, such as me, who are not privileged to live nearby. So engaging local stakeholders is both a practical management advantage and an equitable consideration.

Greater stakeholder participation could, at the very least, educate the local public about conservation needs and practices. Exposure to the facts, and a better working relationship with NPS professionals, could also dispel fundamental misunderstandings about the management of the ONSR and the Draft GMP (many of which were expressed during the public meetings that I attended). Examples of these misunderstandings include an expressed belief that all river baptisms require a federal permit; a perception (fueled in part by claims from an elected representative) that the NPS plans to close dozens of traditional access points and thus cut off access to the rivers for local residents; a belief that the millions of tourist dollars flowing annually into the ONSR and surrounding communities will be lost if NPS implements its preferred management alternative. These easily-disproven claims, and many others, would be less likely to be repeated and become a sort of lingering local mythology if stakeholders had greater and more regular access to information about management choices and to the managers charged with making those choices.

Greater local stakeholder engagement could also encourage a stronger local commitment to support and comply with new rules and restrictions that emerge from a new management plan. There is a wealth of research showing that compliance rates increase among populations that buy in to rules or feel a greater ownership of the regulations that govern their conduct. NPS cannot be in all places at once - no agency can - and the enforcement of rules designed to protect and conserve will very often rely on voluntary compliance or local reporting of violations. Thus, any measure that will strengthen voluntary compliance at a relatively low transaction cost will increase the potential success of a new management plan.

In addition, greater public engagement could help NPS adapt to local concerns that emerge and evolve over time.

Policies can then be tailored to best achieve the goals of the management plan and the ONSR enabling legislation.

So the learning that comes from public engagement can go both directions.

Thomas Jefferson once said (in words chiseled into the wall of the Jefferson Memorial in Washington, DC) I know no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them but to inform their discretion by education. Finding a way to engage the public more fully in the management and stewardship of the ONSR would respond to Jeffersons admonition to educate the public rather than withdraw the power that comes from a greater understanding of, and participation in, conservation goals.

In order to increase public engagement, I offer the three recommendations that follow.

#### RECOMMENDATION ONE: Create an ONSR Citizen Advisory Group

I recommend that the NPS, or the ONSR Superintendent acting under his authority as the manager of the ONSR, create an ONSR Citizen Advisory Group comprised of local residents who are opinion leaders (such as chambers of commerce heads, prominent business owners, high school teachers or administrators, etc) along those who visit the ONSR for recreation and are concerned with its management but do not live locally (such as representatives of public interest environmental groups or tourist agencies).

At the time the ONSR was established, the enabling act also created the Ozark National Rivers Commission, which included seven members recommended by state and county leaders. It was to be consulted from time to time by the Secretary of the Interior or his designee relative to the establishment, development, and administration of the ONSR. But the Commission ceased to exist by the terms of the enabling act 10 years after the ONSR was created.

My proposal is not to recreate that Commission, but to establish a less formal advisory body that can work directly and as needed with the ONSR Superintendent or his designees on matters that arise concerning the implementation and administration of the management plan. This would not supplant NPS authority as a steward of ONSR, but simply engage key stakeholders as advisers, and hopefully as stewards themselves, thus strengthening NPS authority.

There are many models and examples that exist, and I would be happy to provide research to the NPS regarding options and their potential suitability for the ONSR. The emphasis should be on convening a group of a manageable size with sufficiently diverse backgrounds to represent a range of constituent interests (including local residents, property owners, and frequent visitors) and to identify participants capable of communicating their own ideas and those of persons similarly situated. Participants should also be capable of communicating what they learn, informally, within the communities where they live and work. Again, the learning goes both ways.

It is possible that there could be several smaller advisory groups focused on different management issues (like fishing, trail riding, etc) but having a diversity of opinions and interests represented in the group (whether one or several) would be a key to assuring that some of the learning and support for managing the ONSR according to the new management plan would emanate from the group itself.

#### RECOMMENDATION TWO: Establish local ONSR Public Information Offices

I recommend that the NPS Establish local ONSR Public Information Offices on the main streets of the two communities most closely connected to the rivers, Eminence and Van Buren. This could be as simple and inexpensive as an information kiosk within local businesses and/or a small office that is staffed by an existing public information officer or park ranger during peak tourist season or on weekends. The offices could provide information and interpretation for tourists and could also serve as a point of contact with the local community.

The offices would draw tourists to the town centers for information and thus support local business interests that might also benefit from foot traffic. Staff from the offices could also engage local residents informally as ambassadors for the NPS. The offices could also support periodic programming of interest to local residents - such as cultural events or presentations about the natural features or history of the region.

If this approach is successful it could be replicated in other local population centers such as the county seats of Dent County and Texas County, and/or smaller nearby communities such as Summersville and Winona. Staff could be rotated among these more distant communities to save costs and increase the access of local residents to a range of NPS personnel.

The point of this recommendation is that resources devoted to engaging local residents in a constructive and informal way are resources that will help promote a better understanding of ONSR, greater compliance with rules promulgated under any new management plan, and greater acceptance of the ONSR and NPS stewardship as part of the local fabric.

**RECOMMENDATION THREE:** Increase publicly-available data regarding the ecological harms to the ONSR from high-impact use and regarding the economic benefits of the ONSR that are realized through ecologically-oriented use

I recommend that the NPS respond to some of the widespread misinformation among local residents concerning the ONSR and its benefits as a conservation area - as well as the costs of overuse and high-impact use - by (a) using remote sensing technology to document the impact of visitor-created roads (informal trails and river crossings) on the ONSR; and (b) gathering data regarding the economic contribution of visitation to the local economy in a manner that allows the disaggregation of ecotourism benefits from other tourism benefits. The ideas are described in more detail as follows.

(a) Using remote sensing technology to document the impact of visitor-created roads (informal trails and river crossings) as a resource indicator and part of long-term monitoring plans. A periodic effort to document erosion and downstream impacts of informal (and potentially illegal under a new management plan) river crossings will provide tangible proof to support some of the concerns that led to proposals to reduce those crossings. It may eventually be helpful in litigation should individuals or groups sue to reverse rules issued under a new management plan, and it will also help show local residents the harm that these crossings are doing to the rivers. It would be a relatively simple matter to target known informal crossings at times known to be high traffic for horseback riders or all-terrain vehicles and to compare those images to the same reaches of the river at times when fewer or no crossings are made.

(b) Gathering data regarding the economic contribution of visitation to the local economy in a manner that allows the disaggregation of ecotourism benefits from other tourism benefits. By ecotourism I mean tourism activities that have low environmental impact and that are enhanced by more natural, less noisy and mechanized, surroundings. This would require some definitional clarity to assure data integrity, but putting a meaningful number on the clear economic benefit from those who float, hike, and bike in and around the ONSR as distinct from a total number for all visitors would help dispel the misimpression that a conservation-oriented management plan is bad for business. It might also help support the decision by some conservation-oriented businesses to invest in the ONSR and surrounding communities, and thus have a reinforcing effect.

**COMMENT TWO:** The claimed recreational value of high-impact uses must be subordinate to conservation values, and balanced with the value of low-impact recreational uses

It is generally understood that three values drove the creation of the ONSR and must govern its management: conservation, preservation, and outdoor recreation. In fact, the ONSR enabling statute is structured to emphasize conservation first, and it identifies preservation and outdoor recreation as interests that are subsumed as aspects of conservation. ONSR was created:

for the purpose of conserving and interpreting unique scenic and other natural values and objects of historic interest, including preservation of portions of the Current River and the Jacks Fork River in Missouri as free-flowing streams, preservation of springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources thereof by the people of the United States. & (Public Law 88-492, August 27, 1964, 78 Stat.608-610) (emphasis added).

The enabling act also provides that the ONSR:

shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535) [the National

Park Service Act] which provides that The service thus established shall promote and regulate the use of the Federal areas known as national parks, monuments, and reservations hereinafter specified by such means and measures as conform to the fundamental purpose of the said parks, monuments, and reservations, which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

This non-impairment standard also militates in favor of a management plan that places conservation values above recreation values, and would favor preservation over recreation, because conservation and preservation are consistent with non-impairment, whereas recreation - particularly high-impact recreation - always carries a threat of diminishing a natural resource.

Many members of the public who attended the public meetings and commented on the Draft GMP emphasized only recreational values - and only a narrow category of high-impact recreational values at that. The chief concerns that seemed to emerge from these commenters relate to a desire to continue having unrestricted access for power boats, unrestricted access for motor vehicles, and unrestricted access for horseback riders. They opposed Alternative B because it limits and manages access, and some argued that this limitation is inconsistent with the values that led to the designation of the ONSR. But this argument fails for several reasons.

First, the statutory structure (above) shows that recreation is actually a value that competes with preservation as a sub-category of the primary value of conservation. The law is plainly written. So recreational interests must be balanced with preservation interests in service of the more foundational Congressional concern that the ONSR be conserved.

Second, even when balancing recreation and preservation as a subcategory - in service of - conservation, the statute does not treat all types of recreation as equal. It calls for provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources. This distinction is critical because the emphasis is on the natural, outdoor, resources in which recreation occurs - not on recreation as a distinct value. Indeed, recreation that does not depend upon natural resources is not a concern of the ONSR enabling legislation at all. Movie theatres, dance halls, and any number of ancient or traditional recreational activities would have no place in a legislative plan emphasizing outdoor recreation. In addition, any form of recreation that is detrimental to natural resources is anathema to the purpose of the statute and should be prohibited or strictly controlled - certainly not privileged. If, as another example, local residents historically captured fish by using dynamite to shock and kill them (a practice known to be traditional in some parts of the world) that practice, no matter how traditional, could and should be banned from a place where conserving the place itself is the dominant Congressional concern. Similarly, using speedboats to gig fish (claimed by some to be a traditional practice in the area - although the tenure of such a tradition is suspect) can and should be limited, if not banned outright, where the use of the boats is shown to be harmful to the underlying resource. This may seem to be an instinctively correct approach to managing the ONSR - but it is also legally mandated by the organic act creating the ONSR. In this respect, the provisions of preferred Alternative B restricting motorized boats altogether from the Jacks Fork and some stretches of the Current should be maintained because it is an approach most consistent with the statutes mandate.

Finally, even looking at recreation values in isolation (and before any required balancing occurs) it is important to note that some of the recreation proponents (and, certainly, those who spoke the loudest and most frequently at the public meeting in Van Buren) are advocating specific types of recreation that disrupt other types of recreation. Power boats, motor vehicles, and horses (at least in large organized groups such as those sometimes assembled by trail riders) create noise, cause erosion, and introduce organic and inorganic pollutants that impair non-motorized and more natural recreational uses.

I hike along the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers, and I swim and wade in them, fish in them, canoe on them, and camp next to them. I have personally experienced the detriment and nuisance caused by powerboats which can be heard from miles away, and which can be life threatening when they careen around the bends of a river and close in rapidly upon unsuspecting swimmers and waders. I have also seen many examples of riverbank erosion at the access points of informal, unmarked, horse trails used by trail riders. And I have seen the feces from crossing horses left along the river banks and floating downriver from some upstream crossing. I have also seen the sheen of motor oil on the water, and the excess foam caused by the churning of excess nutrients introduced into the rivers from motor boats, automobiles, and horses. So even when balancing these high-impact recreational uses against preservation

concerns (and subordinate to conservation values), high-impact recreation must still be balanced against the many low-impact public uses for which the ONSR must also, by law, be managed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2788    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 22:45:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service,

I believe that Alternative B would be the preferred alternative for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan.

I was privileged to have spent the last summer living in Eminence, Missouri as a part of a botany internship with Lincoln University of Missouri and the Missouri Department of Conservation. During that time, I was able to experience the magnificent beauty of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways on a daily basis helping with endangered plant monitoring and invasive plant species removal. I was also able to witness damage to these precious lands by lack of appropriate management. These included invasive plant species spread by ATV's, damage to streams by lack of marked watering locations for horses, and massive erosion on trails that need more gravel for equestrian use.

I believe that Alternative B would improve the use of trails for equestrian riders, reduce the spread of invasive species and enable our visitors to have a more enriching experience of our beautiful, unique habitat. Our equestrian riders from other states are a great asset to the local economy and should be able to have quality trails. Our diverse plant species in Missouri should be maintained for future generations to view and to maintain the strength of our ecosystems to support our game species.

Thank you for listening to my feedback, and I hope that you will make an informed decision that will benefit our Missouri economy by keeping our ecosystem strong.

Sincerely,  
Erin E. Skornia

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2789    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 22:47:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to submit comments on the Draft General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR).

I am one of the many who frequently visit the ONSR, appreciating the beauty of the rivers (particularly the upper Current, in my case) and finding release from the pace of modern life in the quieter, slower rhythms of the natural surroundings- -at least on weekdays. On weekends, and some other times, one experiences the dark side of the Riverways- -excessive drinking, boorish behavior, loud music, flotillas of canoes and tubes, horses, ATVs, and motorized boats where they should not be. And even on weekdays, one finds at least the residue of this wretched Bacchanalia: polluted water, degraded streambanks, illegal road and horse trail crossings, and garbage, all topped off, literally, by structures constructed in violation of scenic easements. Saddest of all is the absence of the wildlife that should be filling the Riverways with life, scared away from the ecosystems that should be their home and sanctuary.

This is not what was intended by Congress for the very first national river park. The purpose of the ONSR was "to conserve and interpret the scenic, natural, scientific, ecological, and historic values within the National Riverways" (quoted from the Draft Plan), not to degrade them. The continuing damage to the Riverways, which is apparent to all with eyes and brains, is not so much a function of overuse as misuse- -misuse that has been allowed and even enabled over the years by a timid Park Service anxious not to aggravate a minority of loud, aggressive local residents (and concessionaires) who are ideologically opposed to government control of area resources, despite the evident economic benefits to the region. By now, the Park Service should be aware that that minor, if belligerent, segment of the local populace, and their political representatives, will never be appeased- -but only emboldened- -by weak management.

This plan has been very long in the making. It is time for the Park Service to reaffirm the original mandate for the Riverways and make abundantly clear that the ONSR will be managed as a national park and that the highest priority will go toward the protection of the natural values, including wildlife, that made it worthy of that designation in the first place. While Alternative B would be a significant improvement over current management direction, I believe Alternative A, with its greater focus on ecosystem protection and low-impact recreation, would be more consistent with the vision that created the Riverways and mark a clearer break from the dysfunction that has long characterized the ONSR. I ask that the Park Service select Alternative A, including the recommendation for wilderness designation for the Big Spring Wilderness Study Area, while significantly increasing the extent of hiking trails beyond the 15 miles proposed.

Whatever direction the Park Service takes, the keys to its success will be the willingness to commit to that direction in the face of the opposition that will inevitably materialize and, particularly, to enforce the regulations consistent with that direction against those who will most certainly violate them. Among those violations, not addressed by any alternative, are those that ignore scenic easements. The Park Service should take quick action against new and existing structures to protect the scenic value of the Riverways.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft plan.

Sincerely,  
Dan Sherburne

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2790    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 22:49:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Black  
Van Buren Missouri

I have heard that Mr. Jay Nixon has recommended the Plan B. How can this be so when many people have sent comments that we do not want A, B, or C. Would it be possible to have a meeting with key government people where we can have a verbal conversation to explain what the general public in the vicinity that actually live, use and take great pride in our heritage of generations that have been born & raised on the Current & Jacks Fork Rivers. Our Congressman Mr. Jason Smith has stated that he agrees with his constituents. The new "GMP" is not what is needed for this area! I noticed that there are a lot of words in the plan like (maybe, possible, might, could be, not a lot of definite answers to the GMP)

Right now I feel as if I am living in a Communist Country! I feel so helpless and I know that I am not the only person that feels this way. I can also relate to how the American Indian felt! They were assured the government would provide for them! (The Government Didn't)

You can rest assured that I am only one person BUT there a lot of people that agree with me. I will be contacting every politician, no matter what the office if the ONSR draft GMP tries to restricts the Current & Jacks Fork to where my children, grand children, & great-grand children cannot enjoy the heritage of the area where my parents, grand parents and great-grand parents were raised!

Mr. Black Please e-mail me when & where this meeting can take place!

Yours Truly Charlotte Moss, P.O. Box 151 Ellington, Missouri 63638

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2791    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 22:56:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** February 7, 2014

Ozark National Scenic Riverways  
404 Watercress Dr.  
P.O. Box 490  
Van Buren, MO 63965

RE: Comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan

Dear Superintendent William N. Black,

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR), enabled by PL #88-492, was established in 1964 for the protection of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, as they are of scenic, environmental, and cultural significance. The ONSR is characterized by its clear streams, karst springs and caves, dolomite bluffs, and significant populations of important Ozark plants, macro-invertebrates, fish, amphibians, birds, mammals. This environmental community is unique to the world, and is an extremely valuable natural resource of the United States.

To protect and preserve the ONSR for future generations, I urge the NPS to generally adopt General Management Plan (GMP) Alternative A, with some modifications in consideration of the need for meaningful engagement with local citizenry in their stewardship of and livelihood with their environment-dependent community.

While in many ways I support the National Park Service's preference for GMP Alternative B, it is wanting in a) the lack of understanding the potential impact of motorized watercraft use on the environment and human experience, and b) the failure to effectively plan for the protection of the Ozark hellbender, a key species in the Ozark environment. Therefore, Alternative A appears to more readily address these needs, as it strongly defends the natural environmental conditions. However, Alternative B, if modified to comprehensively protect the hellbender habitat and provide meaningful analysis of the impacts of motorized river vehicles, and allowing for their potential additional restrictions, could be a viable plan.

Having served for more than two decades in the service of environmental and public history, I have come to appreciate the repeated degradation of the natural biotic communities in Missouri, brought about by resource exploitation for short term profit, comforts, and recreation. The interrelation of settlement and exploitation near and around these Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, with activities and interests of the metropolitan region centered on St. Louis, has evolved over the centuries and is complex in nature. Interestingly, the use of what is now the ONSR is of great economic and cultural value both to locals and to those in the nearby urban area, with people of both regions having great passion and connection to these great Ozark rivers. Conservation requires responsible stewardship of our nation's remaining natural resources, and the network of biological communities that support and define these resources. The ONSR is one of the essentially, vitally defining, resources of our region, and must be protected from the tremendously impactful human population numbers and forcefulness of technology.

Motorized watercraft in the ONSR is one of the most difficult aspects of management and resource protection to predict, and the aspect with perhaps the greatest potential impact. For this reason, the NPS must incorporate proactive analysis of this factor into its GMP. Considerate, ongoing, coupled hydraulic-ecological studies of motorized watercraft use, designed to determine effects on the health and sustainability of the biotic community, must be undertaken. This accounting of effects on the region's biotic community (clean water, diversity of native fish, amphibians, macro-invertebrates, aquatic plants, their relationship with birds, mammals, and people, etc.) is necessary to understand this powerful human impact factor on the health and sustainability of the ONSR. Negative impacts of motorized watercraft elsewhere have included their contribution to increased water turbidity, riverbed disturbance, bank erosion, fuel leakages and exhausts, invasive species migration (on motor housings, hulls, etc.), and sound disturbance. Such factors having shown negative impact on wildlife viability, specifically effecting ability to reproduce, maintain shelter, and obtain nourishment. Without understanding the dynamic impact of these vehicles, the consequent long-term effect on the human experience in the ONSR cannot be understood. Increased use of ONSR will undoubtedly translate into greater use of these vehicles. Frequency of use and speeds of some kinds of these vehicles are also likely to increase. Engineering of these vehicles (hull shape and size, engine capacity, fuel use, speed, etc.) will change, as it has over the last 50 years. Motorized watercraft, their evolving technology, and incidence of use should be subject to ongoing analysis in the GMP's regulation of these vehicles.

With 51 species of concern within the ONSR watershed, 4 of which are mussels (out of 19 species of mussels total), 1 is a crayfish, 5 are fish, and 2 are amphibians, the integrity of water quality and the condition of streambeds and banks is of particular concern to a GMP. The Ozark hellbender, like other aquatic species, is affected by many factors of water quality and habitat pressures. Evidence has shown that not only are turbidity and fecal coliform levels a problem for these animals, but so too are endocrine disruptors of unidentified origin, probably from agricultural chemicals and pharmaceuticals contaminants. All such additional burdens push reproduction and survival toward a tipping point for such organisms. A U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service opinion on endangered and threatened wildlife should be of paramount concern to a successful GMP.

The GMP must also address equestrian trails and unauthorized vehicle access that impact sensitive riparian zones, including gravel bars; overcrowding of access points; and rowdy, irresponsible behavior by ONSR users. The GMP must be strongly enforced, as lack of enforcement over many years has led to an uncertain direction for the ONSR. Likewise, identification of cultural and natural features, and clear boundaries and information systems for the ONSR, will enhance users' experience and assist the local community in identifying its asset and value.

Neither the "No Action" plan nor Alternative C are viable for the ONSR. The former does indeed describe current management conditions, wherein ONSR management consists of minimal interpretation and no appropriate enforcement and resource protection. This essentially amounts to a plan not to manage, and contradicts the charge of the NPS. Alternative C sacrifices the environmental conditions on which the ONSR's scenic nature is based, providing short-term gain and financial benefit to very few individuals. The consequent degradation of the riparian environment in this "playground scenario" cannot be substantiated as being for the benefit of American citizens since their common natural heritage, and claim to the indigenous beauty and redemptive pleasures, would be irrevocably denuded.

As NPS is the agency which facilitates stewardship of our National Parks, its staff has my strong support in its ONSR analysis and management efforts, and I urge it to adopt and enforce a GMP that protects and preserves this riverway system as a natural environment that is the foundation of culture for both people who live within it and those citizens of the United States to which it belongs. That plan is Alternative A, with recommended amendments to enable local citizens to substantially take part in the care and stewardship of the natural culture of which we are all a part. This requires an all-out inter-agency/multi-level governmental effort to support local schools and community groups in education about the natural biological systems that support life; significantly promotes local economic benefit from business concessions, services and programs, and renewable resources that participate in the ONSR's use and welfare; and support of cultural stewardship, engendering ethical care of the environment, rather than extractive exploitation, of this region.

Sincerely Yours,

David Lobbig

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2792	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 7, 2014				

ONSR Superintendent Bill Black  
Ozark National Scenic Riverways  
P.O. Box 490  
Van Buren, MO 63965

Superintendent Black,

As we have discussed on multiple occasions in-person, I am opposed (individually, and speaking for the overwhelming majority of the 37,000 constituents that I represent) to the National Park Service's (NPS) preferred "Alternative B," and to the further restriction of enjoyment/access for all users. Adoption of the "No Action Alternative," with a priority placed upon enforcement of existing regulations, would continue to protect the natural features of the area, while being the least disruptive to the local culture and economy. I consider the following comments to be separate and substantive, and should you disagree, I would appreciate a detailed explanation which outlines your reasoning.

When the Ozarks National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) was formed in the late 1960's, land was purchased, donated by the State of Missouri, and also taken from private landowners through eminent domain for the purpose of conserving/protecting the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers, natural features, and recreational opportunities for "future generations." Alternative B (NPS Preferred) of the Draft General Management Plan (GMP) directly contradicts the goals set forth when the ONSR was created; through increased restrictions on access and the outright elimination of recreational activities in vast portions along the riverways. Allowing users to responsibly experience this area that we agree is special was the central idea shared by property owners, the State of Missouri, and the NPS when the



ONSR was created; rather than to create restrictions so that fewer individuals will be able to enjoy this treasure. It also bears mentioning that the comment/regulation process being used in this instance is severely flawed. Users should not have to comment/advocate to prevent further restrictions from being implemented. Conversely, the burden should fall upon the NPS to justify your proposals to the users; with the final decision resting in the desire and interest of the people we serve.

1. Ironically, the GMP is not "General." Alternative B is very specific in the restrictions that are proposed.
2. When this area was identified as a special area that was worthy of management by a governmental agency, the very river accesses and roads which you now seek to close (or limit to hiking trails) in Alternative B were in existence, and are currently utilized by patrons, park staff, and law enforcement.
3. Current regulations exist to curtail lewd/obscene behavior, horse/vehicle traffic in the river, unsafe/discourteous motorized boat/floater traffic, and littering. Alternative B does not resolve these issues. A visible presence and enforcement of existing regulations is a solution currently at your disposal. At current funding levels, if you are financially unable to enforce current regulations, why would you seek to expand restrictions further? Maintaining a "family friendly" atmosphere should be a priority of any future plans.
4. Closing 2/3 (65 miles) of "undesignated" horse trails will be detrimental to a vital area of our local economy by further limiting the amount of our beautiful scenery that can be enjoyed via horseback.
5. Eliminating motorized use on the upper stretches of the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers is unacceptable. These areas are generally "self limiting" due to the amount of water available, but should remain accessible to users within the current limitations. The use of motorized boats in these areas is not prolific, but is a very important alternative for those with mobility challenges to be able to enjoy the scenery that the upper stretches afford. The use of small john-boats for fishing and gigging is a very significant part of the local culture. The most common use of motorized boats on the upper parts of the rivers are for "river clean-ups," when many tons of trash are hauled out of the rivers by local volunteers (Not NPS employees). I personally know of a number of individuals, that while enjoying the upper stretches, have come to the rescue of someone in a medical emergency. The benefits of motorized use (within the current limitations) far outweigh any problems, and should not be further restricted.
6. Camping along the river on gravel bars should not be limited to "designated areas." Part of the enjoyment of floating/boating is being able to camp at a convenient time and location along your route. Attempting to regulate this is nearly laughable. While the NPS has focused on closing camping areas in recent years, there should be a renewed effort to attract families to visit, camp, and enjoy their stay; rather than to say, "You can't camp here, because it's not designated."

Your consideration of my comments is appreciated. Should you wish to work together for the betterment of the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers, while jointly preserving the recreational opportunities that many enjoy and numerous families rely upon, I would be happy and willing to assist. This entire situation/discussion revolves around stewardship. The individuals in this area (who live, work and recreate here) have been responsible stewards for generations, in ensuring that the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers are maintained in a pristine state and available for all to visit and enjoy; which is incidentally the same reason that some wanted to designate this as a Scenic Riverway roughly 50 years ago. The question which logically follows: "Is the NPS maintaining the balance of stewardship given to them, through the proposal of the GMP Alternative B?" Sadly, I would say not. If the GMP Alternative B is implemented despite the concerns that have been expressed and the detrimental effects (culturally/economically) which will ensue, I will again state my commitment of "returning the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers to State management," so that the original intent of the founders of the ONSR may be fulfilled; "For the purpose of conserving and interpreting unique scenic and other natural values and objects of historic interest, including preservation of portions of the Current River and the Jack's Fork River in Missouri as free-flowing streams, preservation of springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources thereof by the people of the United States...."

Yours in Service,

Representative Robert Ross  
Proudly Serving the 142nd House District  
Texas, Howell, Phelps, & Pulaski Counties  
Missouri House of Representatives

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 22:57:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the thorough research that clearly went into the management plan and support the National Park Service decision to favor Alternative B. Within that framework, I would prefer as little impact on the natural resources as is possible and an emphasis on education for visitors, potential visitors, surrounding communities, and those with economic interests in the area about the uniqueness of the habitat and its plants and animals and the effects of recreation on them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2794 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Comments on Draft GMP, Ozark National Scenic Riverways

I thank the National Park Service for addressing many of the problems that have grown and festered at ONSR in recent decades. I have enjoyed the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers since the 1960's in all seasons, canoeing and camping, bird watching, and enjoying the beauty and serenity of the area. The former State Parks at Round Spring, Alley Spring and Big Spring have thrived under NPS management.

I believe Alternative B provides the best balance among the three alternatives while still addressing many concerns: protection and interpretation of the natural and cultural resources of the Riverways; commitment to deal with unauthorized roads, horse trails, river accesses and crossings, and ATV use; restoration of degraded land and riverbanks, especially in the riparian corridor; and use of zoning and other systems to better distribute visitor use and avoid conflicts should contribute to a healthier river, enhanced regional economy, and increased visitor satisfaction.

Specific comments regarding Alternative B:

**Staffing levels:** Staffing levels need careful attention in the final draft. New staff in resource management and science are needed since these are the staff who will have responsibility for restoration of degraded lands in the riparian corridor. Restoration of degraded lands in the riparian corridor should receive priority over construction of new infrastructure and facilities if resources for adequate staffing levels cannot be made available.

**Restoration of problem areas:** Seriously degraded areas, such as the riverbottom land across from Welch spring that has been critically marred by a maze of unauthorized, heavily rutted roads and traces, should be restored to natural river bottom forest, not hardened for continued motorized use. This side of the river should be maintained in a natural state as a scenic asset for visitors to the developed area across the river at Welch Spring and for floaters passing on the river.

**Horse trails and camping:** It is critical to close and restore the maze of unauthorized horse trails and river crossings and to develop some better designed trails that avoid sensitive riparian areas. I support consideration of a horse permit system to control horse use and believe that a private horse campground outside the park would contribute more to the local economy and conserve limited park lands for less damaging, higher priority uses.

**Primitive and gravel bar camping:** I strongly support the closing of the unauthorized maze of roads to primitive campsites and gravel bars, and the clear designation of authorized primitive sites and gravel bar camps, some accessible by motor vehicles and some walk-in. All designated primitive and gravel bar camps accessible by motor vehicle should be screened from view from the river, just as developed campgrounds are. Gravel bars and primitive camps should of course continue to be freely available for camping and day use from the river.

**Horsepower zones:** I support horsepower limits for river zones, though gigging with motors are a traditional use may be considered an exception to the non-motorized zones in the upper reaches of the Current and Jack's Fork for such use in the non-peak season.

**Natural and Cultural Resource Restoration:** I strongly support both natural and cultural resource restoration, but believe that in riparian areas there should be no new conversion of bottomland forests to open fields. Forested riparian corridors are critical to stabilize riverbanks, especially in view of the likely impacts of climate change and

severe weather events. All restoration should be with native species.

Scenic Easements. The more than 9,000 acres of private riverine land under scenic easement to NPS need to be effectively monitored, enforced, and corrected to avoid the sorts of violations that have occurred in recent decades.

Wilderness: I ask that management of the 3430-acre de facto wilderness at Big Spring continue into the future, as proposed in Alternative B, in order to provide continued opportunity for wilderness-type recreation and to maintain the area's availability for possible eventual designation by Congress.

Hiking trails: I support the proposed increase of hiking trails and especially urge NPS to partner with other federal and state agencies and non-governmental organizations to develop interconnected long-distance hiking trails across multiple ownerships.

Financial support of ONSR: Financial and administrative support of enhanced funding levels by the regional and national offices of NPS is absolutely critical if the new management plan is to be successful in reversing degradation of resources and enhancing visitor experiences for the long term.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2795    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 22:59:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the NO CHANGE alternative to the draft management plan. The National Park Service (NPS) has done a poor job of enforcing the rules set by the current management plan. If the NPS would enforce the current rules that are set by the current management plan then there would be no need for a new management plan. There are a few issues I would like to address with the current management plan alternatives.

The first problem I have with the current, preferred alternative the proposal to close x number of roads and x number of accesses. If the NPS would list the proposed accesses to be closed, and both scientific and political reasons to close said accesses, then give a reasonable period and engaging conversation to talk about why these accesses should be closed, there would be more understanding of the closure of these accesses. This would be a better alternative than just closing accesses with a pen stroke.

Horsepower limits being used to close boat access above Pultite, during off peak season many people use a boat to gig and to fish for trout,during the peak season these groups of users are off the river before floater traffic becomes prevalent. So, to discriminate against these users only degrades the river system. Some common sense has to be exercised with setting river use limits.

The concessionaires should be held responsible and should educate their clientele on the various groups of users they will encounter on the river. An educational speech or brochure would help to curtail differences.

I am out of time for submitting my comments but I ask for a common sense approach to a new plan and pray that the NPS will preserve equal river use and sustained access the the riverways. The funneling of mass ammounts of river users to a few points will only create more problems.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2796    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 23:01:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Superintendent Bill Black  
Ozark National Scenic Riverways  
National Park Service

Dear Superintendent Black:

I write in response to the ONSR Draft Management Plan.

My husband, Holly, and I own four brick-and-mortar outdoor specialty retail stores in the St. Louis, Missouri

metropolitan area and in Columbia, Missouri, and we sell on line at alpineshop.com.

Our personal as well as our business vision is "Generations transformed by discovery outdoors". Through our classes and community outreach programs, we encourage people to get outside. We see firsthand the health benefits of spending time outdoors.

Our business was started by Bob Mooers as Mooers Alpine in Webster Groves, Missouri, in 1973, selling canoes and rock climbing and backpacking gear. Holly bought the Shop in 1978 and changed the name to Alpine Shop.

From the beginning Holly sent his family and his friends to the beautiful spring-fed streams of the Ozarks. Over the years we have sent countless people from around the world to enjoy our rivers and streams.

Among ourselves and our customers we have hikers, trail runners, bikers and equestrians as well as people doing watersports of all types. Everyone wants to share the same special places.

Now it's clear that in the ONSR we are loving our rivers to death! We know we users are part of the problem. We are lucky to have a world class resource that supports our local economy and is sustainable long term. It should be given the same level of attention and protection as our other National Parks.

In 2010 the non-profit organization American Rivers named our precious Current and Jack's Fork Rivers to the Top 10 Most Endangered List due to failure to enforce the existing Management Plan. Now we have a new Forest Supervisor who pledges to enforce the rules as they stand. We need to make sure there's enough funding for enforcement.

The new Management Plan, which will govern management of our National Park for the next 20 years, is the perfect opportunity to write down "how it looks when it's right".

We believe that Option B is a reasonable compromise, as the minimum of protection for our ONSR. Please help us to assure its pristine condition for future generations.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa and Russell ("Holly") Hollenbeck  
Alpine Shop

cc: Missouri Congressional delegation  
Governor Jay Nixon

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2797    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 23:19:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I had many misgivings days earlier, prior to reading a portion of the D-GMP, most of which have been quelled now. This report appears to me to be well thought out and very comprehensive, considering every possible factor and the expected outcome of every possible choice. My two biggest concerns were (1) Fear of irreparable damage to some facets of this irreplaceable treasure we know as the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, if measures are not strong enough to protect it from overuse, and (2) Fear that the very peoples whose culture and traditions we are striving to preserve will be unfairly infringed upon in our efforts to sustain it. Now, I feel that consideration is at least being given to every issue. I wish every person had had an opportunity to read it, as I feel many with objections have unfortunately been misinformed about what this plan really says. This grieves me, because I think almost all parties (except maybe some self-serving politicians) care deeply for the Riverways and have only to come to some kind of agreement as to how its preservation and enjoyment is to be accomplished. That being said, I think Alternative B, the NPS-preferred plan, is the most desirable. The one thing I would be even more restrictive on is reducing horsepower limits more than in Alternative B, but not as much as Alternative A. There are dozens of places nearby for motorboats, but only one place like this that is the closest thing to a wilderness

as you are ever going to have around here; where minimal noise and effects on streambank erosion, water turbidity, and the effects of these parameters on sensitive foundation microflora and fauna, invertebrates, etc. are things that most people never think about.

And I think the Wilderness proposal deserves further study and is not ready to be decided at this time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2798    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,20,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Re: Comment Period Extension, ONSR GMP

Dear Michael,

First and foremost, I want to thank you and your staff for releasing a General Management Plan that offers substantial

improvements in protections for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I just submitted our organization's official comment on the plan and I'm looking forward to the public hearings in early January.

I'm writing today as the official representative of Environment Missouri and Environment Missouri Research and Policy

Center to request that you do not extend the public comment period for the draft GMP past February 7th , 2014.

We agree that pushing the public hearings into January was a prudent move given the weather in Southeastern Missouri

earlier this month, and we think it entirely reasonable that the comment period be extended for a month after the public

hearings to give individuals and groups the chance to thoroughly develop and articulate their thoughts on the GMP.

However, it has come to our attention that organizations and individuals, all of whom appear to be in complete opposition

to a management plan of any sort, are agitating for a further extension in the comment period.

We believe that this is just a stalling tactic and that those who are asking for the extension are merely seeking more time

in which to figure out how to delay, hinder or derail the GMP process. This is a blatant subversion of the rationale behind

public comment periods and shows complete disrespect and disregard of the National Park Service's mission to protect

and preserve the places that make America so special. For the sake of the park, and all Americans who believe in the great work that you do, please refuse any requests for further extensions of the comment period.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2799    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,09,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Reynolds:

We, the Commission of Shannon County, would like to ask you to consider going with a

No Action Plan on the basis of the economic impact study completed for our area. Our

county is one of the poorest counties in the state of Missouri and we are very

economically deprived. The tourism industry is our major source of income for our

county government and the citizens of this county. The above mentioned plan would add

to the difficult situation the county government is currently experiencing in trying to

provide necessary services for our citizens. Our county does not have the resources

available to supplement a loss of revenues in the tourism industry that we rely upon. The

county real estate property taxes are very limited due to the ownership of over fifty

percent of our land by the state and federal government. We feel this General

Management Plan would greatly reduce the tourism industry as well as be a financial

hardship to the local concessionaires, citizens and area businesses of Shannon County.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways was originally designated for recreational

purposes. According to the Alternative B, there will only be 8.8 percent of the land the

park owns as resource based recreation and 72 percent of it designated as natural, out of

88 thousand total acres. When the recreational area is greatly reduced, there is no way

that will not have a significant impact on the economy of Shannon County. We feel this

will also affect all tourists across the United States from being able to come and enjoy our parks.

We feel the Alternative C would have been a lesser impact on the economy of Shannon County, as it has 59.6 percent being resources based recreation and only 28.2 percent natural. We respectfully urge you to reconsider any plan that has the potential to erode our tourism industry and economic base of the county.

Sincerely,

Jeff Cowen, Presiding Commissioner

Dale Counts, Northern Commissioner

Herman Kelly, Southern Commissioner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2800    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,24,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Michael Reynolds

Regional Director

National Park Service

601 Riverfront Dr.

Omaha, NE 68102-4226

Re: ONSR GMP comment period extension

Dear Mr. Reynolds,

Dec 24, 2013

I am writing on behalf of the Missouri chapter of the Sierra Club regarding the comment period for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan revision process. The comment period is scheduled to end February 7, 2014 and we recommend that it not be further extended.

Our 8000 plus members in Missouri cherish the ONSR as an invaluable local and national resource. We began engagement in the GMP public participation process in 2006.

In the intervening years various events have conspired to lengthen the process. We value the NPS' perseverance and hard work in developing meaningful alternatives aimed at protection of the riverways and enhanced recreational opportunities. NPS also included a public input component at each step.

Most recently dangerous winter weather compelled the NPS to reschedule public meetings and extend the comment period. That was a prudent and appropriate decision. We understand that some requests for even further extension have been presented to the NPS. However, barring any similar weather event, we urge the NPS to carry this process forward without delay. The ONSR has contemporary problems which are not met by the current, outdated plan. The public deserves to see the GMP process completed and the park managed under an updated plan.

Sincerely,

Caroline Pufalt, conservation chair

Sierra Club, Missouri chapter

7164 Manchester Ave

Maplewood, MO 63143

cc Jarvis, J., Black, W.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2801    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** In the opinion of my local people as a whole, I believe that the draft management plan that the National Park Service has selected will have no effect or changes to the riverways that will benefit anyone. What I

mean is that horsepower has nothing to do with problems to my knowledge of the riverways. If it's boats that the tourists dislike while canoeing or tubing, changing the horsepower will do nothing. I know for a fact that there is a review of our riverways that takes effect every 20 years. Those words came straight from Bill Odonell's mouth. I own the local barber shop in Winona, MO. Mr Odonell is a customer of mine, he came in on the 14th of January 2014, and I quote, "The Park Service is required to review the management plan every 20 years, they are not required to make changes. I personally believe that would be best, No Change". On top of that Mr Odonell's statement, he also said and I quote, "It's all about revenue." He continued with, "It's not the money that is already in the Ozarks it's the "New Money" meaning the tourist. If that is the case, I guess all the taxes we pay and money we spend year round does not matter. That is an important statement. We the people were here long before it was park service. I agree the canoes have all the right in the world to be anywhere on the river they want. In the same token, so the do the local people with motorized boats. We already have restrictions on where we can go, and everyone has adapted, and accepted it. If you think this is going to solve problems I think you are badly mistaken. This will not only cause more negative attention to the tourist. I personally hear a lot of people in my shup probably 100 people a week and they all say they have adapted once they want again. There will be more problems because of grudges held against the tourist and the Park Service. If you want to cause the biggest uproar between folks in the Ozarks. Go ahead with the plan. I personally do not have any intentions on doing any harm or causing problems with tourist or the Park Service. But mark my word if things change you will start a local civil war, and there will be consequences. I strongly believe that no change is the best scenario for the locals, the tourists and the park service. I hope this is reviewed and reconsidered, because if not my son, 8 months old, could eventually never enjoy the riverways like I did if more and more regulations are put on them all the time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2802    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I feel that the outboard motors should be left as is. The most of the motor traffic is during gigging season at which time there is very little or no canoe traffic. I think the local people should be able to use the river at this time as they would not be interfering with anyone wanting to use the rivers. The use of outboards will be eliminated by the flow of the river especially above Alley due to the fact the river is too low to run with a jet. I think the HP limit is sufficient at this time on all parts of the river.

Jerald Conway

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2803    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I think there should be more conservation and park people monitoring the rivers more. There seems to be more drunk people on the river that throw there their trash on the river and in general do not take care of the river systems.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2804    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I see where the no-action plan is only a baseline for all other plans. That is a shame because this area is not a playground for people who are here a few days out of the year. This is where people live, raise their families and have for years. The NPS has intruded plenty on the local population; please give them a little breathing room.

Thank you,  
Steve Conner  
Willow Springs, MO  
4th Generation Family in Eminence

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2805    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** NO ACTION PLAN! I want the plan to be kept the way it is! I have been floating the Jack Fork for 50 years. Park Service made things worse!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2806 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Less human influence is better for the area. Keep it natural as much as possible. The more people that come into the area, the more that nature will change.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2807 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Emily Maltby

4046 Utah St

Saint Louis, MO 63116-3815

(314) 608-9082

Feb 7, 2014

Jonathan Jarvis

Subject: I'll stand up for the rivers I love

Dear Jonathan Jarvis,

The Current and Jacks Fork Rivers are iconic to our state. Their beauty and ecological value cannot be overstated.

I hope that you give these rivers the protections they need by implementing the strongest possible management plan.

Out of the three options, I hope you use Alternative A as the basis of your new plan.

We can't afford to wait to begin protecting and restoring our beloved rivers. Please act quickly to finalize the plan and begin implementing a better management plan for the Current and Jacks Fork.

Sincerely,

Emily Maltby

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2808 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** We are living on land about half way between Current and Jack's Fork Rivers. Lots of land all around us was homestead. We feel as if our rights to enjoy the freedom of going to the river with our families are being overridden by the Park's Plan. Stores in Eminence and surrounding towns are being impacted by the plan for the riverways. We will not have the freedom we once had to enjoy the rivers as we once did.

Truman and Shirley Conner

HCR1 BOX 157

Eminence, MO 65466

Big cities should not have the right to vote on these matters, which they do!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2809 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I have lived here close to the riverways all my life. I have stayed here because of current river, so my kids could be raised around it, and enjoy it. Not because of the economy or the poor revenue in this area. Now NPS is wanting to cut down on our rights concerning the river like HP and access to the river. We can't get out family up the river in less than a 40 HP. Also we only live 12 miles from the river but love camping with some privacy. If they cut off access and campgrounds we are not gonna have any privacy. People populated places come here get away from that and that's why we do to. So please leave out campgrounds and access points alone, so we don't have to camp with 100 or 1000 other people at one time. That would not be enjoyable for our kids at all!!

Thanks

Jerad Tucker



---

**Correspondence ID:** 2810    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** I feel that the outboard motors should be left as is. The most of the motor traffic is during the gigging season at which time there is very little or no canoe traffic I think the local people should be able to use the river at this time as they would not be interfering with anyone wanting to use the rivers.  
The use of outboard's will be eliminated by the flow of the river especially above alley due to the fact the river is too low to run with a jet.  
I think the h.p. limit sufficient at this time on all parts of the river.  
Gerald Conway

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2811    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** I think there should be more conservation park people monitoring the rivers more. There seems to be more drunk people on the river that throw their trash on the river in general do not take care of the river systems

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2812    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I have a big problem with restricting people more and more. I pay my taxes here, live here, and plan to stay here for the rest of my life. But this is still a free country last I knew. The river will restrict itself; the Park Service does not need to. I strongly oppose plans A-B-&C. I feel this is going to be the straw that broke the camel's back.

Thanks,  
Victor Elliott

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2813    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** I see where the no-action plan is only a baseline for all other plans. That is a shame because this area is not a playground for people who are here a few days out of the year.  
This is where people live, raise their families and have for years. The NPS has intruded plenty on the local population, please give them a little breathing room.  
Thank you,  
Steve Conner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2814    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** No Action plan! I want the plan to keep it the way IT IS! I have been floating the Jack Fork for 50 years. Park Service made things worst!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2815    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** Less human influence is better for the area. Keep it natural as much as possible. The more people that come into the area, the more that nature will change.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2816    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,22,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Alternative A appears to be the best. It is a good balance of use while protecting the natural

resources. The other alternatives look like they would lead to considerable deterioration of the resources and decrease the experience for the ones that come to enjoy nature, rather than run through it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2817 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** We are living on land about half way between Current Jacks Fork River. Lots of land all around us was homesteaded. We feel as if our rights to enjoy the freedom of going to the river with our families are being overridden by the Parks plan. Stores in Eminence surrounding towns are being impacted by the plan for the Riverways. We will not have the freedom we once had to enjoy the rivers as we once did. Big cities should not have the right to vote on these matters which they do!

Truman Shirley Conner

HCR 1 Box 157

Eminence, MO 65466

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2818 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** Ive lived here close to the riverways all my life. Ive stayed here because of current river, so my kids could be raised around it, and enjoy it. Not because of the economy or the poor revenue in this area. Now NPS is wanting to cut down on our rights concerning the river like HP accesses to the river. We cant get our family up the river in less than a 40 hp. Also we only live 12 miles from the river but love camping with some privacy. If they cut off accesses and campgrounds were not gonna have any privacy. People from populated places come here to get away from that and thats why we do to. So please leave our campgrounds and access points alone, so we dont have to camp with 100, or 1000 people at one time. That would not be enjoyable for our kids at all!!

Thanks

Jerad Tucker

Ellington, MO

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2819 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** NPS-

As a lifelong visitor to the region's wilderness areas and natural places, and as someone who has often wished to be able to live full-time in these wonderful places, I would like to offer my support for Alternative A. This alternative, in my opinion, offers the truest adherence to what was described as "traditional" use when the riverways were founded. For generations prior to the advent of motorized recreational river travel, the Current and Jack's Fork River offered quiet solitude. It was a rightful vision for those involved in the protest of the destruction of this area with high dams to have the foresight that this area should be preserved and returned to a more natural state. Prior to this, the riverways were decimated by logging. This decimation was, in my opinion, something that led to the proposal for high dams. if we do not do all that we can to protect the little remaining wilderness we have then we are doomed for a future in which my children and grandchildren cannot enjoy these wonderful areas. There are plenty of places in the area to play with expensive and loud toys (RV's, loud motors, ATVs). There are few quiet places for reflection. Perhaps if those who were feeling as though their rights are being infringed upon would put up their loud toys for a short time then they too, could see and hear that they could also benefit from the silence and solitude.

Eric Wilkinson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2820 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Sirs

My concerns are regarding the possible horsepower changes on the current river. Below Big Springs, I feel it should be left the way it is. The bigger concern to me is the fact that the floaters are so destructive, we as boaters are always cleaning up after them. The Bedells put all these people on the river and never clean up after them. NEVER take any responsibility for them. I always see boaters clean up after them; The Bedells should be required to have their staff

follow up with a cleanup crew.  
Thank you

Alyson Kirn

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2821    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I am a strong supporter of keeping the Ozark National Riverways a National Park. We float the river and peacefully enjoy the more secluded experience the Current River allows. Unfortunately, over the Years more access has happened even in the upper sections of the river. I believe alternative A should be adopted. These rivers should have a special status. I also hope the Big Springs Wilderness Area will be adapted, either A or B. Missouri has a number of great wilderness areas, Big Springs would be added.

Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2822    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,21,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Sir:

The founding fathers of this nation that wrote the constitution wanted to be sure that the Federal Government would be limited in its powers over the people and the states so they would be free from Federal Government intervention in their lives. It is being shown that "Big Government" is overstepping its boundaries by wanting to control everything which is both inefficient and harmful to the American people. In this case, of which there are many, I'm referring to the natural resources that are present within the boundaries in 16 state of Missouri. I therefore respectfully request that the Federal Government give back to Missouri the right to manage its own natural resources that it could be free of existing and future Federal regulations.

I have land that floods on a regular basis because of a huge gravel bar that has vegetation on it thereby backing up the natural flow of the river which causes the water to overflow onto my land. I'm told by the DNR that I can do nothing to prevent this from happening. It would be best for the river and my land to remove this gravel bar. But because of non-sense Federal regulations I have no right to remove it. So I vote for less regulation with the no action alternative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2823    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I personally am more for the more conservative aspect of these plans. I am an avid hunter and outdoorsman and I love the natural scenery. These plans to use a good portion of the land to keep maintained in my opinion would hurt the natural "flow" of the species inhabiting these lands.

Thomas Rozier

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2824    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** Victor A. Elliot  
HC 89 Box 762 Winona, MO 65588

I have a big problem with restricting people more and more. I pay my taxes here, live here, and plan to stay here for the rest of my life. But this is still a free country last I knew. The river will restrict itself, the Park Service does not need to. I strongly appose plans A-B-C. I feel this is going to be the straw that broke the camel's back.

Thanks,  
Victor Elliot

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2825    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I would support Alt B. I agree the Riverways has areas where large motorized boats should not be allowed. I also support limited canoes put in along the Riverways. Current usage is way too heavy in the summer. I do not support spying techniques to try and catch violators whatever they are doing.

I believe that all the old roads should not be closed. Locals have used river access where ever. Why should the NPS tell them where they can access the Riverways? Problems on the river are by over usage from floaters, more than people using old logging roads.

Primitive areas in Alt B should still be able to access without a canoe. All canoe camping should be open along the entire Riverways.

Sincerely

Gary Buchanan

President of Shannon County Hunting and Fishing Club

We are open to being good neighbors and partners with the NPS

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2826 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I believe that alternative B is the best plan for our parks. I think it is well balanced between the amount of motorboats allowed on the water along with the HP. I think the plan will still keep small canoe renting business in action which is very important to me considering I know a family that owns a canoe rental shop. This is just a little comment to say that though many people may protest Alternative B, I agree with it.

Sadie Frank

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2827 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** I say leave the river aloan why do u people have to take away our rights. There isnt alot of boats come above round springs so don't mess with it. I camp at mouth of sinking and very few boats come up river. Why cant we use 40 hp boats above round springs during gigging season all u do is idle any way and there is no canoes that time of year any way. I say delet all horse back rideing. We have one river and they are making a mess.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2828 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** I think the #1 priority should be ENFORCEMENT of any existing rules There is no enforcement of rules with horses. Or illegal access points. I float and camp along the rivers I find it almost impossible to find a camp spot on a gravel bar that doesn't have a road leading to it. I've been invaded by horseback riders many times riding along the rivers right down all the gravel bars. People are partying in their vehicles right on the gravel bars. I'm afraid to camp at all on the Currant any where prom Cedar Grove down stream. There are numerous areas open to horse back riders all around the area. Let them ride elsewhere. A riparian habitat is no where for horses.

Of the alternative offered. I like plan A the best but it doesn't go far enough to get rid of horses.

You really need to close the illegal accesses!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2829 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** I think these rivers the Jack Fork and the Currant are probably the prettiest areas in the US administered by your agency please protect them for my kids and grandkids

Skip Doak

266 Mound Ridge

Cook Station MO, 65449

I just thought you ought to know that not all the locals are abusers of the river

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2830    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** I have a problem with camping rules. U people need to be more friendly with people. Not be so strict when there is room we want more campers and tents on each site and make each unit pay. U say U R going broke but U wont let us have more units per site. And let us back out on gravel bar at sinking. U need to stop being assholes about sinking campground people come to have good time not be bitched at by park service all the time. U people could let some thing slide  
I say leave the river aloan  
Who gives U the rite to make these rules any way

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2831    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** My main concern is the involvement of the Dept of Interior with the United Nations as an advisor in implementing Agenda 21 Sustainable development. Too many decisions are made behind closed doors without Congressional approval. I am strongly opposed to any more restrictions on my right to enjoy the Riverways. In my opinion the state needs to manage the Riverways to better serve the people of Southern MO. We do not want NGO's with radical agendas dictating what best for us.  
John Clinton  
3750 Hwy EE  
Salem, MO  
65560

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2832    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN,  
I GET LESS AND LESS TIME TO SPEND ON CURRENT RIVER EACH YEAR ALTHOUGH I LOVE FISHING AND CAMPING THERE AS WELL AS GOING ON AN OCCASIONAL GIGGING TRIP. AS I GET OLDER I CAN'T WALK DEEP INTO AREAS LIKE I DID WHEN I WAS YOUNG. MOST OF MY TIME IS SPENT FROM ROUND SPRINGS UP TO MONTAUK. I DO NOT WANT TO SEE ANY ROAD CLOSURES OR ANY FURTHER RESTRICTIONS ON MOTORS ABOVE ROUND SPRINGS. I THINK THE MAGANGEMENT PLAN DOES NOT NEED TO CHANGE.  
RANDY ADEY  
PO BOX 931  
LICKING MO 65542

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2833    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** I prefer alternative A of those offered. I have been floating the river for forty years and I've seen enough of horses and rednecks in 4WD truck on the river. Close them out!  
Jerry Juds  
PO Box 1243  
Sedalia, MO 65301

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2834    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I think we should keep the riverways the same as they are now. Over the weekend, I visited a handful of springs such as the Big Spring and Alley Spring, Both of which I thought were absolutely beautiful! Oh Green Spring, I fell in love with how natural the area was. I would say visiting these locations opened my eyes to the natural beauty of Missouri. I'm really glad I was able to visit and learn so much, I hope the landscape isn't touched and stays the same for my kids. With all of the development in South County, I'm sure a visit to these locations

could open the eyes of any suburban teen like myself.

Alyssa Beard  
Lindbergh High School Senior

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2835    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Proposal A comes closest to what I would like to see going forward, that said I have outlined my feelings below.

I have been an avid user of the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers and tributaries since the 1960's. I support any proposal that helps to maintain this watershed's natural state. We have less and less access to primitive nature experience as our countryside is increasingly urban and suburbanized. The purity of our air and water has decreased and is threatened further by overuse of what is left of our heritage. Motor sports should be discouraged. The pollution from ATV's and increasing powerboat traffic is removing the value from our public lands. The costs of cleanup are where the focus should be. It is far cheaper to prevent loss than repair it.

I feel that while there is a tradition of horseback trail riding in the area, I would like to oppose any expansion as the horse waste is a hazard to the water quality in the watershed and thus maintaining diversity of species is made more difficult.

I support the proposal to create a wilderness designation near Big Spring and protect more land from thoughtless exploitative development.

If management of our heritage is destined to change then let's save what we have and do a better job of protection, not moving backwards.

Richard K Brown

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2836    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Plan, no change, Alternative A should be implemented because if we ban boats from the locals it will affect their transportation and their fishing season. It's been working for the rivers for the past decades. It's like taking the cities highways away from them.

Luke, Jake, Natalie and Lizzy  
Lindberan Highschool

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2837    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I would like to see the Caves re-opened. I believe white nose syndrome is spread by bat to bat. I believe there is a lot of misinformation on this. And yes, I like bats.

Plan B, I think.

Deb Hart

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2838    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Comments on the plan

1) I support Plan A

2) I would like to see these items considered

A. Slow down motorized watercraft

B. Quiet the motorized watercraft

C. Improve the trash situation, implement a process such as they have on teh the Buffalo River, specifically:

-All coolers must be strapped shut

-Any cannot in coolers must but in a floatation/foam container

Thanks  
Frank Wentz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2839    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I would like to see no change. There is no need for more boats on the river. I am a student at Lindberg High school and I have canoed and floated the Current River many times. I believe it is lovely the way that it is and I would hate to see the gorgeous nature even more disturbed.

Sincerely  
Brooke Ewin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2840    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I strongly prefer Alternative A, because it increases primitive/natural areas, and restricts motorized use of more the river for more time.

If I want a Jet Ski experience, I can go to Lake of the Ozarks...if I want a wilderness, quiet float; I'll go to Jack's Fork.

Of the plans, Alternative A, seems to \*try\* to get control of the horse trails. I'm not so opposed to dedicated horse trails, but I am very opposed to renegade horse trails that destroy hiking trails - horses are very destructive to trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2841    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I strongly believe that there should be no change on the Missouri Rivers. I am a high school senior that loves to spend a few weekends on the rivers each year canoeing and camping. I think the rivers are great the way they are, and the amount of use on the rivers should neither increase nor decrease. A change in the amount of river usage could alter many important things on the rivers from wildlife, water quality and business.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2842    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I feel that the NPS (OSNR) should make every effort to accommodate the entire American tax paying public in their endeavor to enjoy this beautiful area of Missouri's Ozark's.

This should be accomplished without with wasting of taxes on too much over restricting adm. expenses.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2843    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I support Alternative A to protect our rivers. The Current River is a national treasure which needs to be preserved for the use and pleasure of all. Trucks and ATV's on illegal roads pollute the air, water and soil, and disrupt the tranquility of the river. Horse trails are also fouling the river.

Big Spring is amazing and should have status designation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2844    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Thanks for having this open forum tonight. Thanks for thinking about the future of the Current River, a great river, and a fragile river.

Of course I'd like to see a lot of conservation efforts. I'd also like to see people enjoy the river. Enjoy the river without polluting the water and banks.

Too many road accesses, too many horse trails, motorized vehicles can't be good on this fragile environment. I am for Alternative A

Thanks again  
Paul Ohlendorf

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2845    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** My name is Randy Reece. I first visited Big Springs as a child and floated on the Current River when people still lived in stilt houses, with no electricity or running water, along the river. Big Springs is pristine water and needs to be protected at least to the degree that Alternative Plan A could provide. Having also lived in Oregon for more than 25 years, I have seen the protection of water quality, fish and wildlife habitat that is more the norm in that state and could be afforded for a Big Springs Wilderness Area.

Randolph Reece

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2846    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** My name is Rob Compton, and I'm a resident of Washington, MO. I support Alternative A because I'm a hunter, fisherman and taxpayer. I believe in the Park Services mission and the concepts of stewardship, and the status quo degrades the wilderness and habitat of the Ozarks.

Thank you  
Robert M Compton

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2847    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** GREENWAY NETWORK, INC. PUBLIC COMMENTS  
NPS DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC WATERWAYS  
Greenway Network is very happy that the NPS understands the national treasure of the fragile Ozark Scenic River Ways. Our Mission is "to conserve natural resources, encourage sound management of the watersheds". We also are a Missouri Stream Team Association and have a strong desire to both educate the public and network with agencies, schools and others about river conservation issues. Greenway is celebrating 20 years as an all-volunteer conservation group!  
Greenway Network has reviewed the Draft General Management Plan/Wilderness Study/Environmental Impact Statement, and we appreciate the attention to visitor education and connections to natural resources and cultural landscapes as provided in Alternatives A and B. We were especially impressed with the attention to detail regarding the impacts that climate change is having on the fragile Karst watershed.  
However, Greenway Network does not agree with the conclusion that Alternative B should be the preferable alternative. As the preferred environmental alternative, "Alternative A would best protect the biological and physical environment" and should be selected as the preferable alternative for management of the Ozark Scenic Riverways.  
Greenway Network feels that the upper reaches of the valued Ozark streams are pristine and should be conserved and protected. Although the MoDNR is the lead agency of the watershed above the parks, we request that NPS network closely with them to reduce contaminant loading before entering the parks and in the gap property line. The upper section of the Jacks Fork River should be zoned "primitive" to retain the "wild, natural character and maintain natural conditions and ecological integrity." The highly porous nature of the karst geology in the Current and Jacks Fork River "can create direct pathways for surface contaminants to quickly enter the groundwater system where remediation is difficult." For this reason, nonpoint source pollution discharges from recreation land uses (e.g. designated and undesignated horse trails) and agricultural land uses (e.g. cattle grazing in the floodplain, riparian zones and streams) should be eliminated or managed in such a way to significantly reduce runoff and infiltration and minimize impacts to ecological habitat. NPS should consider increased funding through grants or other means that will expand E. coli



testing making the tests accessible to local Stream Teams. Utilization of local water quality monitors will greatly leverage limited resources to expand testing. Greenway would like to request the NPS monitoring plan, locations, frequencies and data collected. Greenway Network stands ready to assist In the efforts to improve water quality in all Missouri rivers and streams through our local monitoring activities as well as through our educational programs and events. Our annual Race for the Rivers Is a great opportunity to work with the NPS and the paddling community to increase educational opportunities targeted directly at recreational users of Missouri rivers. We also extend an open invitation to the NPS to participate In our River Soundings Symposium, the Big Muddy Speaker Series and to have booth space at Mission: Clean Stream/GM Earth Day.

Greenway Network wishes to thank the NPS for the opportunity for this Public Comment and to also thank NPS for hosting the local meeting here in St. Louis.

Submitted and presented at the Public Meeting at Powder Valley in St. Louis on 1-22-2014

Dr. Michael V. Garvey

Greenway Network, Inc.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2848    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear NPS friends

Thank you for your thoughtful study and recommendations. We appreciate this opportunity for input. I support Alternative A. I am a retired teacher who loves to hike, backpack, tent camp and canoe. I was very alarmed on my last week long canoe float on the Current River as almost every gravel bar had road access (mostly unauthorized). I found that the people using the roads were men with motorized boats and 4 wheel drive vehicles. They were drinking alcohol. The combination of motors, men, and drinking made me feel unsafe as a woman who was doing overnight gravel bar camping. There needs to be a deterrent to road access to the river. I support making our wilderness accessible to a lot of people but there also need to be areas set aside for those of us what to experience the wilderness without the roads.

Sincerely

Kathy Peterson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2849    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I've been alarmed by the degradation of the Current River for the last 10 years. I've seen trash and human feces littering gravel bars, eroding and rutted out trails and roads leading away from almost every gravel bar, ATV and pickup truck tracks on every gravel bar, night gigging fisherman coming by campsites after we have gone to bed.

The management plan is very necessary. I prefer Plan A because without it, there are very limited locations where a wilderness experience away from people and motors and noise are possible. We need restrictions for some parts of our natural area because all other rivers are not part of the National Scenic Riverways.

Dan Mosby

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2850    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** The Ozark National Scenic Riverways has been so important in my life since my husband first took me down to Current River in 1981-82. I felt like I had come home. The miracle of the spring fed waterways is astounding and it is so important that the land is taken care of and kept in its natural state. I am in favor of Alternative A.

My name is Nick Davenport. I live at 612 Cleveland Ave in Kirkwood, MO. I watched the effect of lost funds for the National Park Service during the Reagan Administration and the affect it had on the local economic impact.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2851    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

I have been fortunate to explore a number of our nation's finest national parks and forest service wilderness areas. Yellowstone, Acadia, Grand Teton, the Smoky Mountains, the Wind Rivers in Wyoming, and the San Juans in Colorado are some of the magnificent places that I've experienced alone and in the company of others.

While a walk along the Current or a float down the Jacks Fork will not include a panorama of alpine peaks or a sunrise over the Atlantic, close inspection reveals beauty no less sublime. Water, transparent as air, dances down riffles and into the aquamarine depths along an ancient bluff line. Delicate fronds of ferns cascade from a shady alcove, while just across the river, the bold blossoms of prairie dock glow in defiance of the scorching sun. People I've taken here, people with whom I have stood atop the Continental Divide deep in the heart of Wyoming, are as moved by subtleties of Blue Spring as they are by impossible heights of the Rockies. The rivers, as you know, are a national treasure.

Yet, we allow this treasure to be diminished. Quiet enjoyment is displaced by the almost constant drone of jet-boats. The woods, the fields, the gravel bars, and the river itself are all scarred with ATV tracks. There are no jet-boats screaming up and down the Snake River at the base of the Tetons and no fleet of ATVs tearing up any beach at Acadia. Float the Current or Jacks Fork and you'll see this in spades.

Just this past spring, my wife, my two young sons, and I rounded a bend near Lewis Hollow below Akers only to be greeted by gunfire on one side of the river and a school bus, two RVs, and five other vehicles on the opposite gravel bar. Years ago, there was no road to this spot. Now there is a 10 foot wide, eroded gash through the forest, all the way to the river. There are frequently RVs parked along the river bank at Twin Rocks. An old forest track at the "jumping rock" above Pulltite now serves as a full blown jet-boat launch site. And the list goes on. The river is commandeered by the few to the detriment not only of the many who come to experience the rivers as they were meant to be, but to the obvious detriment of the rivers themselves. We permit abuses in the Riverways that would not be countenanced in any vaguely comparable location. There is no excuse for this.

It is for these reasons that I write in strong support of most of the Park Service's draft management plan. The Park Service's preferred alternative forges a workable compromise among the competing demands on the rivers. If the rivers are to remain relatively pristine in perpetuity, you simply cannot permit the continued proliferation of unauthorized roads along the rivers. The Park Service's preferred alternative addresses this issue.

The preferred alternative falls short, however, of adequately addressing the use of jet-boats, particularly on the Current River between Round Spring and Two Rivers. This stretch, along with the upper Jacks Fork, represents perhaps the finest stretch of float stream in the state. If motorized boats are to be permitted for the sake of motorized access, such access can be achieved, as it is on the Buffalo River, by boats equipped with low horsepower motors. Some say that further limits will end a long-standing tradition of jon-boating the rivers. This is absurd. The famed wooden jon-boats of the Ozark rivers were never equipped with modern jets that allowed

them to virtually fly up and down the river. The only discernible reason for allowing jet-boats on this stretch of the river is to satisfy the demands of a miniscule minority of river users who desire not only access, but access via a high speed joyride.

Limiting the use of jet-boats above Two Rivers is no more a limitation on access than requiring people to walk down the sidewalk rather than drive. The Riverways were not set aside to ensure some imaginary "right" to an aquatic superhighway; but on most days from May through September, that is precisely what it has become.

Throughout this process, the park service has gathered and received loads of data demonstrating the exponential increase in motorized use of the rivers. Those who dispute these facts rely on hyperbole rather than reality. This is because the

facts are irrefutable and demonstrate conclusively the need for reasonable limits on motorized use of the Riverways.

There is, however, a more fundamental issue than the facts and data demonstrating the wisdom of reasonable limits, and it is this: in the long run, it is our shared experience of the rivers that will dictate how we choose to treat the rivers. The decision you face is not one that can be made solely on the basis of numerical reduction. To do so would relegate the rivers to the status of a mathematical abstraction; a set of extrapolated data, a point on a graph, a simple resource to be used according to popular whim. To make the wisest decision, you must account for not only the numbers, but the reason why so much time and toil has been expended on gathering those numbers. The reason is the rivers themselves and the unique, increasingly scarce opportunity they provide for potentially world class outdoor experience. The legislation establishing the Riverways recognized these values and must be re-affirmed. When the rivers become, as they have in many places on many days, nothing but an outdoor amusement park, people come to see them and treat them as such. One need not spend much time on the rivers to see this. If this continues, the time is not far off when most people have no recollection of a peaceful day on the river; no deep, personal conviction that the rivers are a treasure at all. If that happens, degradation will continue and the Riverways will become a national park in name only.

There is an easy way to avoid this. Adopt the preferred alternative, with a slight modification to limit jet boat use on the Current above Two Rivers. There are hundreds of thousands of acres of reservoirs in the Ozarks that are open to power boating. There are hundreds of miles of Ozark rivers to run jet-boats as one sees fit. , Conversely, there are precious few miles set aside for the overwhelming majority who seek a quieter experience. Please, take this opportunity to do what is right both for the rivers and the vast majority of river users. Limit the use of jet-boats above Two Rivers.

Sincerely  
Eric Peterson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2852    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I understand this has to review every 20 years so that said I would prefer that the only thing that be done is to ban or prohibit any alcohol on the river. That alone will limit who wants to come. At the very least put a limit on beer only 2 per person but that is the only problem.  
Possibly require that whatever goes in has to come out. But that is all that I want to see changed.  
Please don't try and do anything else. People who float the river have been on the date I have seen (post-dispatch).  
If you follow through on any of the other plans it will greatly limit my ability to use the area. I am disabled and need 4x4s. I can't walk that far and can't ride a horse. I have enjoyed the river as is and don't want it changed. I go to the area at a minimum of 3 weeks a year.  
Leave any further regulations to the State of MO.  
Special Interest groups should not rail road this area to something that I can't use.  
Please, please, please don't change the river

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2853    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** To: The National Park Service and all Concerned Citizens  
My love affair with the Ozark National Scenic Riverways goes back more than 50 years. I got my first taste of what Shannon County has to offer when my parents gave me the treat of a lifetime in the eyes of any outdoors-oriented preteen - a two-week stint at Camp Zoe on Sinkin' Creek.  
On a hot summer's day, we couldn't wait for our cabin's turn

to plunge into that clear, cool, refreshing stream. And then the highlight of the camp session was a float trip on the Current River down to Carr's General Store. We took in all the sites along the way with eager eyes: the fishes, the crawdads and the river bottom; the ferns, the birds, the rock outcroppings and the high, craggy bluffs; the springs, and the current of the river as it carried a fallen leaf to an unknown destination. We were always curious about what might be around the next bend and we anticipated the thrill of tackling the next set of riffles. To an eleven-year old youngster, these waves looked like ominous Class III rapids. Ah, the wonder of it all!

Fast forward to 1969. Picture yourself as a 21-year old newly-wed. The Viet Nam war is in full swing and your military husband has limited time off before continuing his training to go overseas. You want a honeymoon on a budget in a place of incomparable beauty. Where would you choose to go? We chose Round Springs. At that time, I believe it was a state park and from there we could take in the beauty of the area's springs, caves, rivers, trails and towns.

We have continued to enjoy the Ozark National Scenic Riverways over the past thirty years. We have shared this magnificent gem with friends, family and neighbors; with scout troops, church groups and adventure groups. We've enjoyed blacksmith demonstrations at Powder Mill Ferry, grist mill operations at Alley Springs, cave tours at Round Springs, hikes and trail maintenance on the Ozark Trail and the Laxton Hollow trail, rock climbing and swimming at Rocky Falls and the best part of all, floating on the Current and the Jacks Fork rivers. The eleven-year old inside of me still shouts out, "Ah, the wonder of it all!"

I hope I have conveyed my deep, passionate feeling for the ONSR. I believe it is a treasure well worth preserving for future generations. In order to achieve that goal, I believe it is critical that we collaborate to develop a workable management plan. My hope is that the final plan be a consensus plan, that is, one that all parties can accept - even though it may not fully solve each party's needs and desires. According to Superintendent Bill Black as quoted in a Nov. 7, 2013 on-line article of the Reynolds County Courier, the "Preferred" Alternative plan "represents a balance among the wide range of interests people have in Ozark National Scenic Riverways".

This sounds like a good starting point for developing a final plan for the long-term benefit of all. As a citizen of the "Show Me" state, I want to show off and be proud of what we have to offer to the rest of the country - a unique, recreational gift. I want others to come explore and discover what I have. I hope they too, will enthusiastically say, "Ah, the wonder of it all!" Let's do what we can to keep that wonder alive!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2854	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Other				

**Correspondence:** I would prefer alternative A I think all horses should be banned! No horse allowed any where within 1 mile of the river area.

I think whatever plan is adapted you must enforce it. KEEP THE 4WD vehicles off the illegal accesses.

Jeri Doak  
266 Mound Ridge  
Cook Station MO  
65449

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2855    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** This is to address some of the comments made by Jason Smith in his Capitol Report in the Nov 20 Current Wave. I am not a spokesman for the Park Service and in fact was opposed to the park when it was established, mainly because I didn't think it was right to take the land along the rivers from those who owned it. I grew up in Eminence and have been an observer of the park since it was proposed.

Rep. Smith starts with a wrong statement and builds on that inaccurate foundation. His second paragraph starts with "In 1964 the National Park Service included the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways with the goal of preserving access to the Rivers."

I don't recall that that was ever a goal of the ONSR. There was never a problem with access to the rivers. The ONSR was created with a dual purpose, to preserve the natural beauty of the area and to provide recreational opportunities. Those purposes are often in opposition and it has been a continual conflict for managing the park. Should the park be a wilderness experience where people can enjoy unspoiled nature with minimal modern intrusions or should it be an amusement park with unlimited numbers of canoes, high powered boats, ATVs, and horseback riders. I believe the park service has tried to strike a balance.

I think most people would agree that the thing we love about the area and what attracts most visitors (on which local businesses depend), is its natural beauty. Would you rather come around the bend in the river and see a deer taking a drink or would you rather see someone's pickup backed out into the river with the radio blaring so everyone within sight can hear it (I've seen this by the way)? Would you rather see a heron fishing in shallow water next to a gravel bar or see tents and cars on what you expected to be an isolated area? The natural beauty is what we have to enjoy and what we have to sell to visitors and we need to be careful not to destroy that. Demanding that we be able to drive to the river wherever we want (especially considering that with modern 4 wheel drives we can go about anywhere), and to camp anywhere we want might be personally satisfying but it may well have a negative effect for the area.

Back to Rep. Smith, does anyone else see the hypocrisy in his report where he states that the park service policies "will damage local economy" and "When bureaucrats in Washington try to restrict land and river usage for families and businesses our district suffers." This is coming from a man who voted to shut down the government and then voted to keep it closed even after most of the other representatives voted to re-open it. Standard and Poor's estimated the cost of the shutdown to be \$24 Billion and said "The bottom line is the shutdown has hurt the U.S. economy." The National Park Service reports that about 700,000 people visit parks every day in a typical October and communities surrounding the nation's 401 national parks see about \$76 million a day in visitor spending that was lost during the shutdown. In Shannon County how many motel rooms and canoes went unrented, how many restaurant meals and how much gasoline went unsold, etc. Representative Smith's policies damaged the local economy.

I would urge people to consider that the park service is not the enemy of local people or businesses. They have no reason to implement policies just to irritate us. Think of how many of your friends and relatives have worked for the park service and how many millions of dollars the park has brought into the local economy. If you want an example of what the river ways would be like without the park service look at Button Rock, which was a primary swimming hole for Eminence people for over 100 years and now has a cabin setting on top of it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2856    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** Jason Stotler  
1515 Hwy. P  
Salem, MO 65560

1-17-14  
573-729-8641

j.stotler@hotmail.com

My father was raised in Cedar Grove in the 1940's. I spent numerous days at Big Creek swimming. I have a family now that enjoy the river near medlock cave. We do not make any irreparable damage to the access roads and the minimal damage that can be seen on the access roads is altered every flood season.

I know several 'old timers' that still use and access the roads. If these roads are closed, the public will lose! If the roads are not traveled by the locals, law enforcement and emergency personal will not be able to access these roads for over time the roads will become overgrown and impassible.

Everyone that I know cares for and helps to clean the river. If you shut the locals out, the park service will have more responsibilities placed upon itself.

Do the right thing,  
Jason

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2857    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** The people of the City of Eminence have some concerns regarding Ozark National Scenic Riverway's (ONSR) Draft General Management Plan Alternative B. We are concerned about the effect it may have upon our economy. Tourist revenues in Eminence have remained flat for about 10 years. With ever increasing costs of doing business, our local economy is suffering at this point in time. Any attempt to further limit the number of visitors will have a damaging effect upon our economy. In a documentary filmed in the late 1970's and released for viewing circa 1980, "Shannon County: Hearts of the Children", Windy Smith of Windy's Canoe Rental in Eminence proclaims that we can put 2,500 canoes in the river on a Saturday". In 1987, local adventurers stacked 767 rental canoes to claim the Guinness Book of World Record's largest canoe tower record. Currently, there are only 700 canoe permits in the Eminence area. During peak season weekend demand, about 500 of these canoe permits are used on the Jacks Fork River, and 200 are used on the Current River. Any further limitation to the total number of floater\$ would have a negative effect upon our economy. There are two statements in the Draft General Management Plan that suggest this may happen. 1) the redesign of access points to alleviate "overcrowding" issues, and 2) a suggestion of 40 canoes per mile of river. A subsection of the DGMP pertains to "overcrowding". Vet, an ONSR visitor survey from 1996 showed that 84 percent of respondents did not believe that overcrowding was an issue. Although we agree that there are a lot of people on the river approximately 25 days/year- twelve weekend Saturdays three 3-day weekend Sundays ten June and August trail-ride weekdays - there are 340 other days in the year, and we do not believe that this constitutes "overcrowding". Instead of fewer canoes, we plead for an incremental increase in canoe permits in the Eminence area. Alternative B proposes a horse permitting system which would further limit the number of visitors to the Eminence area. Instead, we would suggest a well-designed horse trail system that disperses riders away from the rivers. Missouri Department of Conservation's Lick Log trail system does just that, and additional trails will alleviate many concerns without resorting to a horse permitting system. We suggest that you coordinate with MDC to extend our Eminence-area horse trail system. Instead of fewer horseback riders, we need more. We are concerned about the closure of 45 miles of roadways inside the ONSR. We plead for the ONSR to honor the 1989/90 Roads and Trails Agreement, and we ask that ONSR leave open any previously NPS maintained roads. We ask that ONSR not close roads to historical family homesteads and family cemeteries. If closed, elderly residents and handicapped citizens will not be able to access them. And, it is our belief that the ONSR must maintain current roadways for emergency services and forest fire incidents. We support motorized 60/40 boat horsepower limits along much of the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers. However, we want to see traditional motorized boat usage on the upper reaches of both rivers; We are of the belief that low summertime river flow rates are sufficient to regulate motorized boats during peak tourist season.

We insist that a visible presence of law enforcement personnel would positively impact many of the current "problems" that exist in the ONSR. It has been said that 90 percent of law enforcement is simply being seen, so we suggest Park Rangers be more visible to the public. They can offer assistance and advice, and write tickets where warranted.

The City of Eminence completed an extensive water system upgrade in 2013, and we are pleased to announce that we are in the process of upgrading our sewer system. We will replace two sewer main trunk lines, and we will be adding a sewer line into a residential neighborhood. We have completed the sewer works preliminary engineering survey, and our system upgrade plan is in committee at MSWWA. We anticipate start of construction in 2015. Any financial assistance from the National Park Service would be greatly appreciated.

We anxiously await the final General Management Plan, and we plead that you give consideration to our requests.

Signed,

Jim Anderson, Mayor

Mike Atchison, Alderman and Chairman

Ernest Middleton, Alderman

Gary young, Alderman

Robert McQuerry, Alderman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2858    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,10,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** The Eminence Area Arts Council is requesting that serious consideration be given to extending the

comment period for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan Draft. Due to the comment period falling during the same period of time as the holiday season, hunting season, gigging season, and the current inclement weather conditions, specifically concerning road travel, the comment period should be extended to fully accommodate interest parties in this region. In order to best accommodate interested parties, the comment period needs to be extended beyond the 90 days an additional 90 days to allow for proper response from our organization's economic interests and stakeholder interests in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The expansive over five hundred page document does not allow for a proper study of the effects that we should be aware of in our comments.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways not only provides respite for travelers, vacationing experiences, recreational activities, for locals and tourists, alike, but it also provides a much needed income to the local economy of Eminence and Shannon County, Missouri. Because the government ownership of such a massive amount of land in Shannon County, the residents experience lesser quality in social services, road maintenance and construction, and in property tax payments for the schools, not only based on the lack of taxes paid by the government but also because there are very few residences on such lands.

The impact of the ONSR on this region is significant. The Current and Jacks Fork watersheds has provided many jobs, income avenues, and recreational opportunities for generations of the traditional residents of this area. This area is economically depressed and Shannon County is one of the poorest per-capita counties of the United States. It is the lowest income per-capita in the State of Missouri.

It is evident the income derived from the tourist industry is important to the economy. Not only are tourists responsible for a significant portion of our donated dollars, but businesses in the tourist industry are those that support our organization. These funds help support projects for residents, regional residents, and tourists alike. These funds we have allow for us to provide arts projects for the public in this poverty stricken county.

Another aspect of our organization is to promote and protect the culture of the region. This is exemplified in our project through the Civil War 150 program. This program not only allows us to educate people about our culture, but also to educate people about our culture in relation to events in, along, and near the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The access points discussed in the plan are very important to our group, because photographers, artists, anthropologists, historians, and others with humanities interests should have access to points discussed in the plan whether they

are disabled, young and healthy, or elderly. Access to use and to reinterpret nature's beauty into art and humanities should not be limited to those with particular resources nor capabilities. This is why we need further time and discussion on this very important topic of the ONSR GMP.

In the last ten years employment has decreased, residents must travel outside of the county to find substantial work, and residents experience increasing regulations on their recreational activities, forcing some to relocate. The US government is not intended to limit liberty, freedom, nor the right to pursue happiness. These words directly apply to any negative impacts the current ONSR Management Plan Draft contains.

The Draft Plan Comment Period should also accommodate Shannon County residents with a public information and comment meeting similar to those held in Van Buren, Kirkwood, and Salem. The residents of this county should not be discriminated against by not having a meeting conveniently located in relation to their residences. The ONSR manages a significant portion of lands in this county and should take this into consideration when planning a meeting. Information and comment meetings should not only be held conveniently for those with money and resources but should be allowed for those without. We request this meeting to be held within the next month.

There has not been time to allow for the public, nor for the business people, nor the educated and professionals with interest and abilities to research this matter to understand what the draft plan actually means because of the length, breadth, and scope of the ideas located in the document. It is our belief that because of such impact this plan can have on our communities in this area, the economic ventures of business people, and the recreational activities of both locals and tourists, we formally and officially request a further extension of the comment period for this draft.

Please call us upon receipt and acknowledgement of this letter so that we may discuss this matter further.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2859	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Dec,10,2013 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	E-mail
-----------------------------	--------

**Correspondence:** The Eminence Area Chamber of Commerce is requesting that serious consideration be given to extending the comment period for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan Draft. Due to the comment period falling during the same period of time as the holiday season, hunting season, gigging season, and the current inclement weather conditions, specifically concerning road travel, the comment period should be extended to fully accommodate interest parties in this region. In order to best accommodate interested parties, the comment period needs to be extended beyond the 90 days an additional 90 days to allow for proper response from our organization's economic interests and stakeholder interests in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The expansive over five hundred page document does not allow for a proper study of the effects that we should be aware of in our comments.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways not only provides respite for travelers, vacationing experiences, recreational activities, for locals and tourists, alike, but it also provides a much needed income to the local economy of Eminence and Shannon County, Missouri. Because the government ownership of such a massive amount of land in Shannon County, the residents experience lesser quality in social services, road maintenance and construction, and in property tax payments for the schools, not only based on the lack of taxes paid by the government but also because there are very few residences on such lands.

The impact of the ONSR on this region is significant. The Current and Jacks Fork watersheds has provided many jobs, income avenues, and recreational opportunities for generations of the traditional residents of this area. This area is economically depressed and Shannon County is one of the poorest per-capita counties of the United States. It is the lowest income per-capita in the State of Missouri.

In the last ten years employment has decreased, residents must travel outside of the county to find substantial work, and residents experience increasing regulations on their recreational activities, forcing some to relocate. The US government is not intended to limit liberty, freedom, nor the right to pursue happiness. These words directly apply to any negative impacts the current ONSR Management Plan Draft contains.

The Draft Plan Comment Period should also accommodate Shannon County residents with a public information and comment meeting similar to those held in Van Buren, Kirkwood, and Salem. The



residents of this county should not be discriminated against by not having a meeting conveniently located in relation to their residences. The ONSR manages a significant portion of lands in this county and should take this into consideration when planning a meeting. Information and comment meetings should not only be held conveniently for those with money and resources but should be allowed for those without. We request this meeting to be held within the next month.

There has not been time to allow for the public, nor for the business people, nor the educated and professionals with interest and abilities to research this matter to understand what the draft plan actually means because of the length, breadth, and scope of the ideas located in the document.

It is our belief that because of such impact this plan can have on our communities in this area, the economic ventures of business people, and the recreational activities of both locals and tourists, we formally and officially request a further extension of the comment period for this draft.

Please call us upon receipt and acknowledgement of this letter so that we may discuss this matter further.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2860    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,11,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

The Shannon County Democrat Club is requesting that serious consideration be given to extending the comment period for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan Draft. Due to the comment period falling during the same period of time as the holiday season, hunting season, gigging season, and the current inclement weather conditions, specifically concerning road travel, the comment period should be extended to fully accommodate interest parties in this region. In order to best accommodate interested parties, the comment period needs to be extended beyond the 90 days an additional 90 days to allow for proper response from our organization's member interests and stakeholder interests in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The expansive over five hundred page document does not allow for a proper study of the effects that we should be aware of in our comments.

The Democrat Club in our Shannon County represents a wide spectrum of people, as does the Democrat Party. At the root of the Democrat Party is the basic concept to protect and provide for the middle and lower classes as concerns the government. In this case, it is evident the bureaucrats have chosen to deny those in the middle and lower classes the opportunity to enjoy traditional recreation practices in a Recreational Park, known better as the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. It was the Democrat Party of years ago that helped to pass the legislation which made this ONSR a park for the people to enjoy the natural beauty on a personal and recreational level, one that does not discriminate against the elderly, the handicapped, the poor, nor the underprivileged.

Through our initial review of this draft, we feel as though this could have significant impact on the rights of the public to access and to use the ONSR and its waterways, which has prompted us to ask for further time for review of this expansive document. This matter concerns not only travelling to one's ancestral home place, to the graves of friends and family members at the end of every road and trail, but also the legality of denying access to those whom are not able to readily access the public natural beauty on foot. These are all legal matters that should be

given time for the public to review and to properly comment. Considering how long this took the NPS to create the document draft at hand, it should be no monstrosity of an ordeal to extend the time to review this draft and follow proper comment procedures, as requested by the NPS.

It is with this consideration in mind for the elderly, disabled, the poor, and the working class of people, that we also request a location be added to the meeting locations as offered by the National Park Service, similar to those happening in Van Buren, Salem, and Kirkwood, Missouri. People whom are under-represented should not be denied access to the information and to the resources the NPS has at these meetings to better explain and to allow for better, more appropriate commentary. This is why we are getting involved.

Please contact us upon receipt and acknowledgement of this letter.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2861    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,10,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** The "Draft Management Plan" mentions:

'Approximately 25 miles of additional designated horse trails would be provided, including some new stream crossings. Approximately 65 miles of undesignated horse trails and unauthorized crossings would be closed and restored. Design of designated, approximately 23-mile-long horse trail system would be improved to...'

The only trail I see on any of the maps is the 'Ozark Trail' - where would the 25 miles of additional trails be located and what are the locations of the 65 miles of undesignated horse trails that would be closed??

Eminence provides a great opportunity for outdoor enthusiasts of all types. I understand the reasoning behind management; however, if the levels of danger are only during the peak use periods perhaps stringent rules/regulations are not required. To limit the number of people on the river, close trails that have been used for years, and other restrictions would damage the economy horribly in the little town of Eminence not to mention ruin the recreational enjoyment everyone returns to every year.

Enforcing stricter use of the environment and beauty God created would be like displaying fine china that is never to be used and therefore not enjoyed and used to its full potential.

Please reconsider - with the many years of use, the trails are in great shape and should be available to the public to enjoy for years to come along with the rivers.

Thank you for your time,  
Robin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2862 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,14,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Mailing Address:

darynne jessler  
4408 gentry ave  
valley village, CA 91607  
usa

While the new plan does close some undesignated trails that are damaging the local ecosystem, it also authorizes 35 miles of new horse trails with additional river crossings, as well as a new horse campground along Jacks Fork (which the Park Service itself admits would increase the likelihood for water quality degradation). This plan is supposed to revise an outdated 1984 version that has resulted in misuse and water pollution... but will it really do the trick? The hellbender, for one - - an amazing, ancient 2-foot-long salamander, the largest in North America - - deserves more

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2863 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** It is the belief of the Eminence Area Chamber of Commerce, our members, our associates, and our

community (based on facts by people who actually use the riverways), the Ozark National Scenic Riverways management does need change, but the vague, often-contradicting alternatives as presented are not the solution needed. The "No Action" Alternative use, as it currently applies to the ONSR management, should be extended until it is clear more of the advice, information, and commentary from the local and regional population are used in the plan alternatives. It is our opinion that rather than request "No Action" because we do not want experiences within the beautiful boundaries of the ONSR limited, that we, in-fact, propose changes to further the visitor experience one may have in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, in and along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, and throughout the south central Missouri region, some contained in the proposed plans and others not.

The basic idea behind any of the necessity of implementing any of the suggestions for change to the management of the ONSR is to create an experience akin to the core concept entailed with the inception and design of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The thought processes behind these suggestions propose a set of changes not harking back to a time of better management, as when the Missouri State Parks managed the major springs in the area, nor to a time when the Federal Government owned no land in this region, but to offer a glimpse at what an experience in this region of unparalleled natural beauty should really be.

There are preservationists whom want to limit access to this area whether because of strict beliefs, jealousy of accessibility, or because of a particular movement to make the ecology, environment, and life systems exist as they did before European explorers encountered this unique locale. This is based on a belief that humans had no interaction with the environment in this region, which is a falsehood. Land and water throughout the entire planet have had living inhabitants which have made some sort of impact on the environment. In this region, Native Americans lived here, both prior to and during the westward expansion of the Americas. So to restrict access and use of this place because humans never impacted the land, simply put, just does not make sense.

Understanding the land and making sound decisions in regards to its management is the best method to follow. Just as the Ozark National Scenic Riverways was founded in such a unique manner, so should it be managed.

Flagship NPS managed property. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways should be managed as a National Park Service flagship riverways. Rather than forcing a relatively small park such as the ONSR to comply with federal standards for parks and riverways and monuments with very different purposes, needs, and resources, this Scenic Riverways should be managed as a flagship program-one that is a leader and innovator in programs for the Federal government. Changes include tailoring staff, resource use and management, cultural and heritage programs, visitor experience enhancement, as well as recreational opportunities to those actual visitors to the ONSR need and desire. The desires and needs of people who actually visit the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers is what was used to establish the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and these concepts should still be used in the management of it.

Stars Upstream and its author, why he argued for a recreational park. Although Leonard Hall was not a resident of the Eminence area, nor was he originally from this area, Leonard visited the Current and the Jacks Fork River watersheds quite often. It was documented through the local boat and canoe liveries that he came quite often and had a sincere interest in providing for the recreational experience of such a beautiful place as this. His book did argue through propaganda the area needed to be purchased by the government rather than owned by locals, using a few stock photos from area farms not near the rivers, but he used this propaganda for the reason that this area should be open to the public to enjoy, not shut off by a few, whether by mismanagement of the resource, by shutting down the public access by the wealthy elite, nor by placing a lake over this Ozark terrain.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways, in the arguments of proponents of a park, as opposed to the proponents of a lake, was to be an open recreational adventure, ready for the taking of anyone whom might choose to use it. It is not the purpose of the government nor those making rules to discriminate against any group when deciding public policy.

In an excerpt from attorney, Chris Yarbrow, the following fairly describes the creation of the ONSR:

Recreational use was a material consideration during the creation of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). The broad coalition that formed to preserve the Riverways from damming, split due to concerns surrounding intended uses of the Riverways. The initial proposal, the "Ozark National Monument", was unsuccessful in part for want of protection for recreational users. After its defeat, a second proposal, the "Ozark Scenic Riverways" proposal, was given consideration.

In the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee's initial report on the Ozark Scenic Riverways proposal, the committee emphasized the "importance of creating Federal recreational areas" and noted the Riverways' geographic location was uniquely situated for the same. Additionally, the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, reassured the committee and federal law makers that "recreation is a purpose" of the Ozark Scenic Riverways proposal.

With the committee's support, and Secretary Udall's reassurance, the Ozark Scenic Riverways was passed into law with the new title "Ozark National Scenic Riverways."

The stated purpose of the newly created ONSR was:

For the purpose of conservation and interpreting unique scenic and other natural values and objects of historic interest, including preservation of portions of the Current River and the Jacks Fork River in Missouri as free flowing streams, preservation of springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources thereof by the people of the United

States ...

Significantly, the ONSR's enabling act places recreational use on equal footing with the other stated purposes.

ONSR enabling legislation. The enabling legislation establishing the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, rather than simply the Ozark National Monument or a lake in this region, plans for a park which allows the public to enjoy the beautiful natural wonders near and along the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers.

Each sentence of the enabling legislation describes a venture between the Federal, State, County, and City Governments as well as organizations from the region near the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. It in fact states such a fact so clearly that the blatant ignorance for opinions for the local and regional populace in the current plans for the ONSR makes such a process for drafting plans one-sided and should be reconsidered. It is the intent of the enabling legislation to give the population residing in and around the Ozark National Scenic Riverways input in the management of such an integral part of the economy and lifestyle of the south central Missouri Ozarks. Preservation for the sake of preservation and the ideal of a select few should not dictate what the visitors in the ONSR encounter when pursuing recreational activities.

Advisory Commission. An advisory commission, such as the one that was created for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways during the formative years of the park, should be reinstated to provide much-needed oversight for the National Park Service's management of the ONSR.

It is the belief that we should have an advisory board of people in similar fashion as the one for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways that was set up in the enabling legislation of the ONSR in 88-492, which also expired 10 years after the formation of the park, that has been prevalent for many years. It is not unusual for a Federal government agency or entity to have an oversight committee and it is very apparent, especially with the federal tax dollars spent on the General Management Plan draft process, that the ONSR needs exactly that, an advisory and oversight committee. The advisory and oversight committee should be set up in similar fashion to the original advisory committee that was created with the ONSR enabling legislation, but it should have the capabilities to carry out and suggest implementation of policies regardless of the request of the Secretary of the Interior. This should be an ongoing and continuing committee of people to aid in the management of the National Park System management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways-in so doing, the management process would already take into consideration the opinion of the stakeholders for the Current and Jacks Fork River watersheds. This would not only be a time saver, but would save immeasurable dollars spent on the GMP drafting process.

As formed during the creation of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, there was one member appointed from each of the county commissions in which the ONSR is located, Shannon, Dent, Carter, and Texas, as well as two appointed by the Governor of Missouri and one appointee from the Secretary of the Interior. The one issue with the legislation forming this advisory committee was the Secretary of the Interior was allowed to use them at his or her discretion and really an oversight committee should not be used at the leisure of the agency, it should be the oversight committee that reviews policy, practices, and management procedures of such an agency as the NPS and ONSR continually and regularly. It is also our understanding that other agencies of the US government have oversight and advisory committees with real power to suggest policies and help enforce them in the management of the agency.

Campsite Reservation System. Campsite reservations are a common complaint and factor requiring the chamber to make a statement specifically about the disorganization of the present system. It is understood that the NPS presumably pursued using the current campsite reservation system to save money and resources for other ventures within the park. However, the current campsite reservation system saves no money, in fact the current system, shuns away visitors. Since there are no way to make reservations locally nor to track reservations on a local level, campsites remain vacant and are not filled. For example, if a visitor reserves a campsite and does not arrive at the agreed-upon time to maintain the reservation, that campsite is not filled and that campsite is not able to be filled because the system does not account for such actions. When one arrives at a campsite where there are no cell phone towers, no public telephones, nor access to the internet, the local ranger station cannot even help with this venture because the Omaha office must be called and directed through a prompt system that not only confuses, but deters visitors. This is a prime example of visitor deterrent policies.

In fact, some services for the smaller campgrounds have been removed, yet fees are still charged, despite the lack of a trash pick-up service. If it is necessary to raise fees for camping to provide services

for the campsites and to maintain the unique visitor experience, then fees should be raised to accommodate visitors for the campsites they wish to use rather than simply eliminating the services for the campsite and eventually closing that particular campground. This is a general trend for the National Park Service management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and this management style should cease and desist as it currently exists.

In fact, the campsite reservation system should not be held by a Canadian company for the ONSR, specifically, and move to a local position in order to fund a job, and use the \$9.00 surcharge for making a camping reservation to fund that position. Last minute reservations should be allowed for every campsite, without respect to any 7 day advance reservation policy. Campsites should be allowed to be in place for more than 2 weeks at a time, due to the nature of traditional camping activities. In fact, the ONSR camping system should be modelled after the system at some of Missouri's State Parks, where reservations abound throughout the year and tourists and locals alike are waiting in line for reservations. By creating a system similar to that of the one at some of Missouri's State Parks, the reservation position within the ONSR will pay for itself. The campsite system should be tailored to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, rather than tailoring the needs and wants of a much smaller park to those of the giant parks like Yellowstone. The size of this comparatively smaller riverways park system is one that prompts a camping plan which allows for the type of camping that visitors desire and need, rather than complying with and adhering to the policies of larger parks.

Large Boulders and other pieces of obstructive objects. Boulders and travel-restrictive objects placed in and along stream beds, creeks, and riverways are actually detrimental to the ecosystem of the rivers and encourage erosion. Such environmentally detrimental obstructions change the flow of the rivers and streams around which they are placed worse than the supposed activities which they were meant to prohibit. The best plan possible would be to partner with other agencies (ie. the Army Corps of Engineers) to secure river banks and stream banks with protective materials and native plants so that erosion is minimized. This would protect not only the visitor experience, but also the wildlife and plants from erosive effects.

Gravel bar camping. An activity which is a traditional use pattern with no substantiated claims of environmental degradation is vehicular accessed gravel bar camping. This form of camping also helps to alleviate camping at less primitive campsites with more services. In fact, to increase some of the drive-in camping spots at current locations and to improve those sites would enhance the visitor experience and provide for more and different forms of camping that have very little impact on the environment. Basically, drive-in camping is a local and regional resident tradition for many families for generations. Prior to the establishment of the ONSR, extended friends and relatives would come visit this area and stay for weeks at a time to enjoy the pleasures of vacationing in and along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. Prior to European settlement, even the Osage used various spots along what is now the ONSR as hunting camps to refuel and recharge while gathering food for their tribe. Although the Osage did not drive-in to camping locations, it would be assumed that not every one of them arrived to their spot by watercraft.

Canoes, Tubes, Rafts, Horseback Riding, and Jet Boats. It is integral to the economy of the area that access is kept for our canoe outfitters, our horseback riders, and our outboard motor visitors. The experience the groups have should be enhanced, improved, and considered when drafting the management plan, rather than placing limits and restrictions on the recreation they enjoy. It is illegal to double charge horseback trailriders to use the horse trails. Campsites and services for our campers, who prefer public campgrounds, whether large or small, should be improved. Today, people are mobile. Everyone has access to vehicular transportation, so if a tourist does not have a good experience here in the ONSR, they can choose to go elsewhere.

Position on "zoning" of rivers and lands. In the enabling legislation, it is cited that zoning is allowed for the management of wildlife and hunting, in relation to the enjoyment of visitors, public safety, administration and must consult the Missouri Conservation Commission for such topics of discussion. Zoning for the sake of copying urban-planning models is not described in the parks founding documents. Conservation Commission's comment from 2009. There are a few basic concepts that will be exemplified by excerpts from this letter. First, in paragraph 3, page 1, "The Department recommends hunting, fishing, and trapping continue to be allowed throughout the ONSR". This statement clearly should alert the National Park Service to the necessity of keeping access available to the public for the purpose of wildlife management-in fact, this might be a good reason to expand upon the current access points, campsites, and roads along the riverways for that express purpose.

On page 2, in paragraph 1, they state, "Any discussion of boat motor horsepower limits would be incomplete without consideration of the impacts of proposed changes on angler access and fish communities. Zoning based on horsepower dictates where certain boats can gig or fish. Some areas of the river will receive more or less harvest pressure and a corresponding shift in fish community". The thought that there will be fish not every touched or encountered by a jet boat or even by a fisherman is a nice thought to some who wish for no one to enjoy the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, but from a practical standpoint of Resource Management, the rivers should be fished and gilled to help maintain proper fish populations. It is the express concern of the Missouri Department of Conservation to manage the state's wildlife, fish, and forest resources, so their experience and professional opinion should be used for management purposes. As far as the fishing and gilling are concerned with completely zoning out jet-boat transportation along the riverways, this same management tactic would apply. The river needs to have fishing and gilling in order to manage fish species. Further in the letter the Commission states to, "upgrade the existing camping facilities and day-use facilities to attract and encourage families and children to experience nature in the great outdoors." This coincides with the notion the NPS should improve current accesses, campsites, and facilities to enhance the visitor experience, rather than shut-down, close, and block access to resources. In the letter they also state they support the "No Action" plan with a few minor provisions- it is quite evident the National Park Service has ignored official comment from the Missouri Department of Conservation in the current draft plan (an agency to which the ONSR is bound to cooperate with by the enabling legislation) as well as local comments.

Access for the purpose of Wildfire management. It is imperative that because the National Park Service makes no attempts at forest management that every road, trail, and transportation avenue be left open within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for wildfire prevention and management. Although we have not had wildfires in this region for a number of years, that is thanks in part to the preventative efforts of management agencies such as the Missouri Department of Conservation and the US Forest Service. The roads as they presently exist represent years of travel as established presumably by some of the Native Americans and later travelled by the European settlers and pioneers. Eventually the roads and trails that are left today represent a cultural and historical lesson to the student and to the visitor, however, the important lesson to be learned is to allow for proper wildfire management so the entire stand of forest does not burn down. Additionally, such libelous behavior endangers the residents of the region with the likelihood of a wildfire reaching homes and more populated areas due to the unmanaged forest. Roads and trails provide more than leisure activity, they provide a lifeline to wildfire management.

Access for Emergency personnel and management. Closing access points along the riverways is a counterproductive notion when considering the needs of emergency management. If people are injured, have an accident, encounter an issue and need help, it is very important that emergency management personnel are able to access the creeks, rivers, and lands in and along the ONSR.

Access for elderly, the very young, and the disabled. It is a common theme among the federal government at this time that access to federally owned properties (ie. Courthouses, agency offices, public works buildings, public monuments in urban areas, property held in trust for public use), no matter what a person's age, creed, nationality, sex, color, ability, disability, and other descriptive devices used to categorize people and prevent them from accessing what should be available to all people. It is a basic ideal that is embedded in policy, legislation, regulations, and practices carried out by the Federal government-the idea that discrimination toward a segment of society, especially if that segment of society is underprivileged, under-represented, and lacks resources.

It should be noted that by limiting access to campsites only to those who can travel on the river is discriminating against those who cannot ride in a watercraft. Access to gravel bar camping should be allowable by those who can travel by a land operated vehicle-which allows access to the elderly, the very young, and the disabled.

By limiting motorized boat access on certain points of the river, it is not only a discriminatory act against the above-mentioned groups, it is also a self-regulating zoning conversation. Jet boats will not travel on stretches of water where there is insufficient water to travel. During seasons when there is sufficient water in the river to allow jet boat travel, there should be no restrictions. There should be no restrictions in order to allow for the travel of the elderly, the very young, and the disabled to spots of historic, cultural, and natural beauty interest just like anyone else who wants to visit the spot that can travel by foot or a method that is non-restrictive to those in the minority groups aforementioned.

Additionally, the National Park Service has questionable jurisdiction over navigable rivers, no matter whether they fall onto the lands owned by the Federal government. So any limitations placed on jet boats or watercrafts have an equally questionable ability to be enforced.

Access for graveyards and cemeteries. This issue pertains to that of road and trail closures. In a group meeting held in Rolla, Missouri, the Missouri Coalition for the Environment proposed that 64 "illegal" roads and trails be closed due to the fact that these roads and trails contribute to the presence of gravel, through environmental erosion, in the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, which lie within the ONSR. There are three arguments which discount this claim which cites these roads and trails should be closed. First, these roads and trails are not illegal, nor are they new; every road and trail that exists that is claimed to be illegal is a road or trail based from use patterns that exist since European settlement of this area. This information is based on a road and trail study performed in the 1980s which stated these roads and trails are illegal because the National Park Service did not account for them when the ONSR was being formed. This is in fact a fallacy. The NPS, simply put, did not desire for these roads and trails to be accounted for, so they left them out of the original documents describing county roads. This was furthered by the roads and trails study performed in the 1980s. Once this was created, the roads and trails that are now being said to be illegal, some of which are slated to be closed, have actually been in existence prior to the formation of the ONSR.

Additionally, the Missouri Coalition for the Environment and the National Park Service are basing the decisions to close roads and trails on data gathered from studies which is skewed, and non-existent in some cases. There is no proven point of entry into the water system for the gravel which appears in the riverbeds today. There are many theories about this subject, however, none are accepted as being the authoritative theory for where the gravel in the rivers originate. The roads and trails are desired to be closed simply because there is a belief among some environmental groups that access to natural resources such as those that exist in the ONSR should be closed off, exclusive only to use patterns approved by them- -a privilege, in a sense. This is why they push to close these roads and trails. Furthermore, they wish to close off access at the ends of county roads which allow the public to access the river, which is problematic for many reasons, including access for the handicapped, the very young, and the elderly, in addition to emergency management, wildfire management, traditional use patterns, and access to the cultural, natural, and historic locations as set forth in the enabling legislation.

Another point to be considered for the argument to keep the roads open is access to cemeteries, graveyards, and gravesites. Most of the roads and trails within the ONSR lead to a burial site of a local family which resided at that location prior to the establishment of the ONSR. It is very important to the residents of our communities that they be able to access and to visit their family burial plots located at their old homeplaces along the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers. It is cited in the "Management Policies 2006: The Guide to Managing the National Park System" (produced by the National Park Service) in section 8.6.10, that burials will be allowed to be visited by family members or designees. It is important to not cut off the heritage and culture of people from visiting their ancestors at their old homeplaces. Graveyards and grave sites should be given the respect to allow descendants to visit the resting places of loved ones and ancestors, regardless of policy or regulations.

Timber management. Simply stated, a timber management policy of selective cutting, even highly selective cutting would be a wildfire-prevention method, a stimulus to the local and regional economy, as well as provide for safety management for visitors. The NPS could partner with government agency, for example the Missouri Department of Conservation, to actively manage the timber and wildlife resources. Just as it is important to have existing and long-standing forests for animal habitat, it is equally as important to have different stages of the forest to encourage various wildlife populations to flourish and inhabit these managed forests. We do not desire to have visitors of the ONSR to encounter stages of the forest which are cleared or unattractive, which was the sentiment of ONSR proponents and congressional officials at the time of inception and is why the original purchase of land included a corridor of land nestled only next to the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers in most places. This was to control the visitor experience and allow them to see natural beauty from their trip on the rivers. But it is imperative to have forest and resource management for the purpose of wildfire prevention, wildlife proliferation, stable environment conditions, and an enhanced visitor experience.

The basic concepts behind timber management include wildfire prevention, traditional fire patterns the Native Americans applied to the region (which was the environment documented by Henry Rowe Schoolcraft), ecological (meaning ecosystem degradation and regeneration is part of the natural forest

and fauna life cycle), as well as economic.

Gravel removal. According to the plan on page 241, "Gravel mining operations can adversely affect the geology of adjacent tributaries by altering flow patterns, changing channel structure, increasing stream gradient, relocating channels, and causing scouring and bank erosion." This notation does not take into account the necessity for the gravel to be removed as part of a cyclical process. There are no reports, studies, tests, nor hypotheses which prove where the gravel in the river comes from. Frank Hughes, a local scientist and resident, once stated, "that it is very likely the gravel is a cyclical trend and in order to manage it, the gravel must be mined to protect the wildlife and fish, so the streams do not fill up and choke out all the wildlife." Although this alters what the present state is of the rivers, it is a process which the local residents have operated since settlement. These patterns help protect the fish and wildlife to ensure there is a future for them, as opposed to a dry creek bed filled with gravel.

It is very clear, the management of this park should be proactive, rather than laissez faire. The lack of interest by the NPS management of the ONSR extends beyond the gravel, but encompasses tourist information, assistance, and general visitor experiences. Meaning, the NPS does very little to assist the tourist or visitor, except in the form of inspecting and writing tickets.

System of computerized paperwork for park rangers so they may be visible, rather than combative toward visitors. Combative and harassing park rangers is the number one deterrent to recreational experiences in the ONSR, second only to the negative publicity from the ONSR. It is integral in management of this riverways system to have park service employees and rangers to be visible for assistance, information, and to provide a positive presence within the system as far as visitor experiences is concerned. It is not intended for the National Park Service to employ more rangers, more employees, nor additional staff in any form to provide these services, but it is intended to shift the NPS from spying activities on visitors and trying to "catch them in the act" of performing illegal or citationworthy activities. It is meant to provide a regulatory presence. The purpose of NPS staff is to provide help to visitors within the riverways and to enhance the visitor experience. In so-doing, the employees will not prohibit activities by citations, but encourage good behavior of visitors by appearing in uniform throughout the system in a capacity design to assist visitors.

Local cultural and heritage aspects-discrimination and degradation. When the United States government purchased our river frontage, springs, and significant cultural structures, which is the most valuable land and resources in the immediate area, they promised to protect the history, heritage and culture of our river communities. Through a process that negated that promise, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways destroyed homes, barns, outbuildings and other structures of highly significant value, both worthy to keep for posterity and for the sake of our culture and heritage. Fields, most of which were promised to be cared for in the same manner they were left, in order to show what working farms were of the current time and those of the past, to grow over. The experience of people to view life as it was in river communities of the day was severely altered and detrimentally impacted. These concepts were as much a part of the visitor experience as the purely natural beauty in and along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers.

It is peculiar that once again the National Park Service seeks to protect our culture and heritage, interpret and catalog the society that once was and further push our culture to the break of collapse. This form of discrimination is the ultimate detriment to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. It is one that, under the guise of protecting the environment, they close off access, further discourage people to visit their ancestral homelands, and limit the ability of all people, regardless of race, creed, color, culture, access to resources, and ability to fight this cultural slaughter, to truly enjoy what the unique experience is of going to and becoming one with the waters and lands in and along the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

Necessity of management during government shutdown. It became glaringly apparent during the government shutdown of 2013, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways needs to have legislation passed to protect the resource and to protect the rights of the people to access public property, which is owned by the people. There should be no citations issued, no scary signs prohibiting access place- the park should have legislation in place to allow people to access and to use the resource, if not managed by the Federal government employees during the shutdown, then most certainly managed by employees of the State of Missouri, whether by the Missouri Department of Conservation, the Missouri Department of Natural Resources, or by a joint venture between the two. There are examples of similar legislation to keep the park open such as the Washington monument in Washington, DC, and examples from the State of Utah where state employees managed federally owned lands during the shutdown. Similar legislation



should be passed, not only to protect the rights of the people, but so that the economy of our region is not further diminished by the actions of the Federal government.

Legislation to protect activities in and along the ONSR. If it were the intention of those who lobbied to create the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to establish a park where there are no recreational activities allowed, then it would have been set forth to create a park designed to limit visitor activities, focus only on wildlife and fish and plants and other living inhabitants of the ONSR, besides humans, and create a park for the knowledge that someone in St. Louis can strong-arm the National Park Service into shutting down access to this region so they feel comfort in the solitude of the plants and animals here. However, they did not. It was meant, by Secretary Udall, Congressman Ichord, and author Leonard Hall, to have a recreational area-one where people can enjoy the resources, both historical from human habitation as well as natural.

Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968. In accordance with the following statement taken directly from [rivers.gov](http://rivers.gov), the government interpretation encourages use of input from the visitors and resource users from the area near the ONSR and encourages the general management plan to more greatly consider the enabling legislation:

Regardless of classification, each river in the National System is administered with the goal of protecting and enhancing the values that caused it to be designated. Designation neither prohibits development nor gives the federal government control over private property. Recreation, agricultural practices, residential development, and other uses may continue. Protection of the river is provided through voluntary stewardship by landowners and river users and through regulation and programs of federal, state, local, or tribal governments.

Points from the Plan Draft:

Management of "degradation of water resources in the National Riverways from land-based recreation would continue to be managed on a site-by-site, case-by-case basis."

It is clearly stated on page 242 of the GMP, "When the likely effects of the no-action alternative are added to the effects of the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, there would be a long-term, moderate, adverse, regional cumulative impact on soils and geologic resources. The no-action alternative would contribute to an appreciable, long-term, adverse increment to the cumulative effect." In summary, by managing in the present status, the natural resources would be detrimentally affected, which could impact the region for a fairly long time. This statement is based on skewed data, used only by the NPS to shut-off access and use of the resource to make the management of this park closer to the idea of preservationist propaganda. Based on the fact that data gathered and used for the park service studies and results are skewed, thus, null and void, the premise that these resources need to be shut-off is also null and void.

Equestrian pursuits mentioned on pages 252, 253. Studies that have tried to prove adverse effects to the environment from equestrian pursuits have been both skewed and shown to be invalid.

Municipal wastewater discharges on page 253. The City of Eminence is currently in compliance with State and Federal agencies. They have recently completed a community public water project. The city is proactively pursuing keeping the river clean through proper management of the city water and sewer system. "Keeping our rivers clean" is part of the motto of the city water projects.

Vegetation on page 263-264. Vegetation along undesignated roads and trails is not trampled in such a manner as to disturb the plant life in any significant way. It is clear by visiting a road or a trail to see these recreational activities taking place on them do not, in any way, shape, or form, disturb the ecology nor cause detrimental environmental impact so as to substantiate placing it in this document.

Wildlife & Fish on page 276. Some claims are made in this section which related river crossings, jet boats, undesignated roads and trails, and "motorboat-based petroleum pollutants" as causing "water quality degradation and having adverse effects on aquatic habitat. As discussed earlier, studies and data related to pollution have been proven to be skewed and incorrect as far as land-based recreation is concerned. In relation to jet boats "California Standards" apply to the jet boats, which places minute parts per million of pollutants into the water. There were no studies proving that the jet boats had a detrimental effect on the rivers nor the fish nor wildlife. Erosion does not happen from boats, but from the floods that occur naturally. So if it were proven that detrimental effects to the water quality does not happen due to these activities, it should be safe to say that recreational activities within the ONSR do not degrade the aquatic habitat.

Ozark Hellbender. As discussed by a National Geographic study recently published online through the

Smithsonian Institute, "Snot Otters Slipping Away", ambient temperature of the water affects reproductive cycle of the Hellbender. This should be attributed to the increase in the ambient temperature of the air and the importance of environmental factors from other parts of the country, as the water and lands in this part of the Ozarks are well cared for. Another attributable factor is the increased number of bass in the river eating the young Hellbenders, which substantiates furthering the unregulated use of jet boat on the riverways, which would allow continued traditional fishing patterns. 280 1st paragraph, discussion on human interaction with plants and animals. The impact of humans to the ONSR is negligible in this discussion as humans have, for at least a few thousand years, been involved in the environment of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, and should continue to be allowed to be a part of the resources here.

Cultural Resources discussion on page 307. Interestingly enough, cultural resources, as it relates to those with long-time connections to the land and water, in addition to those whom have acquired a connection to the land and water through their interest in History, Anthropology, the Sciences, or SocioEnvironmental

studies, refer to any number of old home places, remnants of structures, former community hubs, schoolhouses, campsites, name-places on the rivers and streams-even when someone has a unique experience at one of these locations without a prior knowledge of the location can inspire this connection-and natural wonders associated with the culture. It is tradition through Native American and European cultures to visit ancestrally connected locations, in fact it appears in several cultures besides the two mention (but these two are relevant for this discussion). The simplest notion of visiting the location where a baby in the family died and was buried on an old farm can represent this connection to the land.

It has been said that this dirt and these waters run through the veins of the people with this connection to the water and land, and so it is impossible to truly separate them from this area. Which, in the process of limiting access and use to any point through the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, it is in fact degrading, discounting, and providing a detrimental effect to the local and regional culture. Although it may also be said that people come from every state in the United States to visit their ancestral homelands here in the ONSR.

To select areas to shut off access and use, to limit regardless of handicap, ability, age, socio-economic level, or connection to influential public officials, is to commit the highest form of an act of discrimination-essentially, this is denial of access to one's heritage and culture.

Historic Buildings and Structures discussion on pages 313-316. It should be the duty of the National Park Service to maintain, catalog, interpret, and provide public information about the culture, history, historic structures, and other parts of life in the past and present in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Historic structures should not be limited to those whom are not disabled, very young, or elderly. Present accommodations for travel to historic structures and locations should, in fact, be increased and accessibility be better maintained. It is impossible to consider making changes to the current management patterns of the historic structures as it is proposed in the General Management Plan when it is purported by ONSR staff that there is not sufficient funding to sustain the existing structures, interpretive programs, and cultural activities that are currently needed.

Ethnographic Impact on pages 322-324. It is presumed that when stating Ethnography, it is not necessarily referring to the culture, biology, social branches of anthropological study of a group in the past-tense. In fact, in the case of the study, understanding, and interpretation of ethnography for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, the ethnography of the group about which they study and promote, is the same group it has sought for many years to close off cultural, social, and literally biologically connected sites along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. In fact, it should be taken into consideration when mentioning protecting the rights of Native Americans to access and to use their tribal lands, that most of the families which settled and lived along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers had Native American ancestry, many times very recent. Most of the residents were of the Cherokee Tribe, however there were many other tribes represented in that group-as prevalent as this topic is, it should be noted that ancestral access to the regions Native American population should not be shut off, bottled up, and held for only a few to view, study, and ponder.

Wilderness designation recommendation-fiscal responsibility. It is a travesty that the National Park Service has actually spent the insurmountable amount of money they have on the General Management Plan process when this could have been so easily addressed with the Advisory/Oversight Committee as mentioned above, in this case, specifically in relation to the Wilderness Study. It is prevalent, even from

the presentation provided by the ONSR during the comment period public forum discussions, that it is not and will not be foreseeably possible for a Wilderness designation to be obtained for any section of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers watersheds due to the process involved to establish such a designation. Considering the budgetary cuts to providing services and offering proper number of staff for recreational activities within the ONSR, this money should have been more responsibly managed. Chambers take on the economy and how the ONSR impacts it. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways has had a mixed review of impact on the counties it is located in. Rather than bringing up historical impacts the NPS had on the resident population of these counties, let's discuss current impact in relation to the impact from recent history. Shannon County, the second largest in acreage in the State of Missouri, is the poorest county per-capita in the entire state. Shannon County is traditionally the county in the state with the fewest resources and is highly isolated, in terms of economics, travel patterns, communication, representation in the government, and education. The county has a majority of the land owned by the LAD Foundation, the State of Missouri, and the US Government. This negatively impacts education, public services, government representation, resident population, job opportunities, and the economy. In-lieu-of-tax payments are substandard and are in no way comparable to what should be paid to the Shannon County government and to our schools. Jobs, that upon the establishment of the ONSR, were explained would be given to locals have been outsourced, whether to Canada for camping reservations, residents of other counties in order to substantiate an impact on a region for payroll, rather than the counties in which the ONSR resides, or that locals are not to be hired because of the idea that Federal employees should not work in career jobs for a Park Service managed property. In being a community member, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is lacking in several aspects, including consideration for publicity and how negative public statements affect the economy negatively, how giving unwarranted citations to park visitors sends tourist dollars away from this area, dollars that are vital to the economy, or when rules and regulations are whimsically applied to appease the section of environmentalists from St. Louis County that have the ear of the Park Service administration in Van Buren and Omaha.

Positive impacts upon the local population are created when visitors have a good experience in the ONSR and do not have to battle superfluous regulations, combative government employees, and ease of access to the resources, both natural and cultural, and use of the resource as traditionally experienced. This process does happen, but we can make the experience even more productive and fruitful for the visitors of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers' watersheds by truly enhancing the visitor experience. The tourist economy is vital to Shannon County, since the land for which productive use for economic activities is owned by the aforementioned entities. Tourism is vital to the economy for many reasons, it not only brings income into the county, but also helps to increase the services of the residents of the county as the tourist need access to those various services as well. Tourists are not only from throughout the nation, but we have local and regional residents that we might consider in the tourist category, this is a definite impact on the economy.

It cannot be overstated how important tourism is to the economy of Shannon County and it should be the duty of the National Park Service to work with our county to improve tourism in this region, rather than to squash and starve the resident population with superfluous rules and regulations.

Plan B Commentary. On page ii of the NPS Summary of Key Concepts for the ONSR General Management plan, Alternative B (which is the Park Service preferred plan) is described that it will "enhance opportunities for visitors to discover and learn about the natural wonders and Ozark heritage of the National riverways, while maintaining a mix of traditional recreational and commercial activities."

We beg to differ on the idea this plan will enhance activities and provide for traditional recreational experiences in many ways. To begin with, there is nothing to be gained from zoning areas and closing off use and limiting use for the traveler, except to enhance the notion that a limited number of people can access the riverways. Additionally, the concept of traditional use is obviously a vision the National Park Service does not share with those whom participate in the traditional recreational activities, because the agency has continually sought to limit access, use, and participation in the riverways, whether because of preservationist doctrine, lack of funding, appeal to particular interest groups, or to make it easier for them to manage fewer people with fewer resources. It is however, not the purpose of the National Park Service management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to limit access and use to cultural and natural resources, nor should it be their goal to limit the economic resources available to the resident population.

People, after reading, reviewing, attending public comment forums, and speaking with NPS personnel

about the GMP draft, question how the NPS can afford to build and maintain a new learning center and other costly proposals in the plan which would require expenditures above what is publicized cannot be afford to be spent to pay for current staff and maintenance.

#### Summary and Conclusion.

Through the discussion of the benefits of using more public input from the actual users, visitors, and residents of the neighboring area, it should be plain to understand the ONSR should make changes, but in a much different manner than is proposed in any of the GMP Alternatives. Even the plan of "No Action" does not address the proper concerns enough; it is however, recommended the National Park Service mandate the use of the "No Action" plan alternative until it is evident more practical and useful changes are made to the alternatives as presented. One way to best understand a method that would steer the organization in the right direction is the establishment of an Advisory/Oversight Committee spelled out above. This could certainly alleviate some of the concerns all stakeholders have.

One very peculiar topic of concern is that of overcrowding along the rivers. To establish a blanket policy across the ONSR to limit activities, access, recreation, and the desire to return to this riverways because of overcrowding along the rivers that occurs a few days a year is utterly and unmistakably a point that proves an oversight committee needs to be established. There are many points along the riverways where people can travel even when there is overcrowding in certain sections of the river where solitude and serenity may be found. Similar to the management of the roads and highways of this nation, it is not their policy to close down sections of the sections of roads most highly used, it is their practice to improve access, resources, and availability for those who wish to travel to be unimpeded. We are in no way suggesting support for environmental degradation due to an overabundance of humans, but at this time there are no worries of this happening. The basic concept to comprehend here is that through a little better management of resources, improved access points, additional bathrooms, better services, many of these concerns can be addressed.

Addressing concerns should, additionally, not be just those concerns of particular interest groups with money, ready access to education and to other resources, such as those environmental groups which desire to shut off access to our cultural heritage-concerns should be addressed for those that actually use the riverways, quite literally assist in the cleanup of the system, protect the environment by individual actions and group actions, and have a year-long interest in the subject, not just those who find interest in this when an email is sent out from an organization with paid staff, lawyers on retainer, and a desire to further limit an entire group of people's rights.

Each topic of discussion here should lead the reader to better understand the necessity of a flagship management program to enhance visitor experiences. Expansion of access and use to create a positive visitor experience is integral to the economy of this region, but commerce is also how the government receives their funding. To limit and to chain commerce to a point where it is not possible by the government is a self-defeating purpose. We request the Secretary of Interior to cease and desist discriminatory practices against the people in and around the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. And we ask to have more and better access to the resources, more reasonable local input placed into the management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, assistance with legislation to protect the true needs of the users of the ONSR, to follow the intended use of the ONSR in accordance with the enabling legislation, to implement a plan to keep the park open during another government shutdown, and to institute an Advisory/Oversight Committee formed in similar fashion as the enabling legislation entails but with more powers to ensure decisions by the committee make an impact.

Eminence Area Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors and undersigned supporters. January 27, 2014

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2864	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,07,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	E-mail				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Mailing Address:				
Bruce A. Cox					
PO Box 475					
Eminence, MO 65466					

Shannon

I have great concern that environmentalist organizations have had a very disproportionate influence on the shaping of the management plan. They are not the major stakeholders. Many of their association members

who have never visited the ONSR. The primary stakeholders are citizens living in those counties where the ONSR is located. Their lives will definitely be impacted if provisions of the management plan are unnecessarily restrictive.

I have read some of the comments of environmental organizations. They talk of significant environmental impact due to too many access trails/roads, too many horseback riders and riding trails, too many ATV riders, too many floaters/boaters, etc. They assert that these uses are excessive and have led to environmental degradation. Yet none of these claims are based on empirical science and should not be considered credible.

I have a Ph.D. in environmental toxicology and have designed and managed many studies on terrestrial and aquatic impact. Based on personal observation and review of aquatic monitoring in the Jacks Fork River, environmental quality in the whole of the Ozarks is very good. If there are terrestrial studies within the ONSR demonstrating significant impact (= decreased species diversity or aberrant diversity indices), I don't know of them. Despite the assertions by environmentalists, the ONSR is in excellent environmental health and is a long way from showing signs of being degraded. It cannot be assumed that the presence of man in a natural environment automatically translates to significant environmental degradation. It does not.

If current management practices are protective of the environment, as they are, why close trails and accesses and impose other draconian provisions that are unnecessary.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2865    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,30,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Please do not eliminate access by horses to the beautiful trails along the Current & Jacks Fork rivers in

Missouri. I have been spending my 1 vacation a year riding these trails for the last 37 years. I pick up any trash if I see it.

All my riding partners also respect this property. Please don't take it away from us!

Linda

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2866    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** I am writing to urge you to take a strong stand for the preservation of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in

Missouri and vote for Management Plan Alternative A. These riverways are a jewel of the south central Ozarks region and deserve the greatest attention. Like many in our state, I enjoy the recreational opportunities made available through the riverways system, but certain private enterprises and individuals are cashing in on the pristine nature of these areas via large-scale trail rides and ATV access in and along these rivers, which are causing extensive damage to the watershed and endangering water quality, wildlife, and others enjoyment of a peaceful day on the river.

I personally have seen large groups of horses standing or walking in the river for long periods of time, during which they not only churn up the gravel and release silt and destroy fish nesting sites, but also defecating and urinating in the river itself.

Not only is an unpleasant encounter for other recreationists, but it is also dangerous for us and our children to play in e-coli laden-waters. ATV's and horses have severely denuded the river banks in multiple locations where they repeatedly cross the river, causing yet more erosion and sediment release into our clear, clean rivers.

Horse and ATV enthusiasts have a massive network of trails already established throughout the Mark Twain National Forests and they don't need these trails to enjoy their sport. In lieu of banning them outright (which I personally favor) horse and ATV enthusiasts should be limited to designated trails away from the river corridor and access to the river should be restricted to designated crossings only and only for crossing - not for lingering, watering, or washing their animals and machines.

In addition, trail riders should be required to tether their horses or park their ATV's (filled and covered with oil, gasoline and other injurious petrochemicals) away from the river when not using designated crossings for that specific purpose.

I would also like to see large-scale private ride organizers should be treated like the canoe concessionaires and limit groups in their scope and size. Not only are these trail rides an environmental disaster in the works, but they are truly unfair to the rest of us who enjoy the cleanliness and tranquility of the riverways system as it was meant to be.

Many in my community, including myself, volunteer their time and effort to keep our rivers free of trash, monitor water quality, and generally maintain and protect this National Treasure at no cost to our state and federal government.

Now I ask you to do your part to ensure that everyone has the opportunity to experience and enjoy the very last sliver of "wilderness" in Missouri and to ensure that our rivers remain protected for generations of Missourians to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2867 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Draft General Management Plans for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

I believe in what Congressman Jason Smith is trying to protect and preserving the rural way of life is in the best interest for the national scenic riverways, to keep rivers accessible, I support the policies that are in his Sportsmen's Heritage and Recreational Enhancement Act.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2868 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Dear Ms Matteson,

Both my wife, Gail and I endorse Alternative A to the Management Plan. We believe this alternative is more in line with our values.

I can see how the preferred plan would be easier to institute than Alternative A with respect to current usage. That said, we prefer Alternative A.

Please include our input,

Brian Page & Gail Plemmons

17 Aldeah Ave.

Columbia, Mo. 65203

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2869 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Mailing Address:

Catherine Reagan

11223 St Rt V

Rolla, Missouri 65401

I want to express my concern about the 65 miles of horse trails being closed on the Current River. While not everyone likes or enjoys horses or trail riding, there are a lot of us that do. I realize there are some bad apples in any group of people but as a trail rider I have seen how my group stop to clean up trash, beer cans and glass bottles along the river's edge. We keep the trails clear of debris and are good stewards of the land.

I support protecting our wilderness but at the same time I support the right of people to enjoy the trails on horseback. As a Senior citizen rider I have waited well over half my life to full fill a childhood dream and to think it might be taken away just breaks my heart. Where I live there is no where to ride but blacktop roads. The trails at Jadwin, MO are close enough that at 71 years of age I can drive there by myself, and have the time of my life.

I implore you to reconsider this closing.

Sincerely,

Catherine Reagan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2870 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** I adamantly oppose the proposal to appease environmentalists by limiting the public use and enjoyment of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. This proposal would hurt small businesses that rely on the riverways and keep Missourians from enjoying the rivers

that belong to them.  
Please do not take action to restrict our use and enjoyment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2871    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,19,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Detring:

I grew up in Columbia, Missouri and the Current River was a haven and refuge for my friends and I in high school and college at the University of Missouri. From canoeing on the Current and other Ozark rivers, I became a guide on the Colorado River in Grand Canyon National Park and guided river trips in the Himalayas, in Africa and in Turkey.

I see from your resume that you have worked in Canyon de Chelly, the Everglades and in Glacier National Park, among other places during your NPS career, so I know you are keenly aware of how fragile and sensitive the Ozarks Riverways are. I also know that as a Missouri native, you are proud of what makes the Ozark National Scenic Riverways unique and you know that our Ozark Mountains, springs, rivers and habitat are a unitary system.

I also realize, as a long-term employee of a park concessioner in Grand Canyon, and through a lifetime of use on the Current, that many people make their livings in and around the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. However, the reason the riverways are attractive is because they are protected and almost pristine. Therefore, I urge adoption of Alternative Plan A, which will provide the most protection and provide the most uncrowded experience for park visitors. Thank you kindly for considering my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2872    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Supt. William Black  
Ozark National Scenic Riverways  
404 Watercress Drive  
P.O. Box 490  
Van Buren, MO 63965

Re: Riverways Draft General Management Plan

Dear Supt. Black:

Although I gave brief oral comments at the Van Buren open house, I hereby wish to give more substantive input into the Draft Management Alternatives. But let me begin by saying that I found the Van Buren meeting to be a poor forum for expressing input on the obviously controversial proposals. The first two hours, wherein NPS personnel provide information and took input, went fine. But the final hour devoted to discussion of wilderness management in the Big Springs section ended up being a free-for-all anti-government forum that was stifling to anyone who wished to express opinions on the wilderness management proposal. Worse, allowing a politician (Rep. Jason Smith's delegate) to do a "crowd rousing" speech at the start created a chilling atmosphere for anyone (like me) who wanted to express a divergent view. I will also hasten to add that I live in Reynolds County and I am therefore represented both by Congressman Jason Smith and by State Representative Fitzwater: the former was represented by Darren Lingle, who gave the opening crowd-rousing speech, and the latter was there in person, yet neither acknowledged that they had constituents, such as me, who strongly disagree with their "No Change" attitude. Neither Mr. Smith nor Mr. Fitzwater has actually conducted a legitimate survey and they therefore cannot claim that they know for certain what their constituents desire in terms of Riverways management. I had specifically written to Mr. Fitzwater asking him to acknowledge that not all his constituents agree with his views on Riverways management: that he failed to do so only demonstrates the efforts that were made to give the appearance of a united "local opinion" when in fact there is no unanimity. Further, it was obvious that many if not most of those attending the Van Buren meeting had been actively recruited to attend multiple open houses to give the appearance that their numbers are greater than they actually are: one person attending four meetings is still just one person!

My following comments basically support Alternative B, the NPS preferred Alternative, with a few expectations which I will clarify.

Re: Motorboat-free zones: One of the speakers at Van Buren (Mr. Fitzwater, I believe) said that restricting motorboats from any sections of the rivers endangers human lives: he obviously is unaware that certain river sections are impassable for motor boats anyways, but mostly he shows his insensitivity to the desires canoeists have for a natural wilderness experience, one which includes being free of motor noises. Would one dare suggest horse-back riders should be accompanied by ATVs because the latter could provide additional safety? Of course not! Anyone canoeing the upper reaches of the Jacks Forks ought to know that motor-boat rescues is not going to happen and that is part of the charm of being there.

As to the amount of river that should be designated as motor free, Alternative B is good but I am moved to support Alternative A which would restrict motors all the way to Two Rivers on the Current and the Jacks Fork. This is a significant stretch of river and motor-free zoning would be much appreciated by canoeists who form the majority of recreational users on both rivers. With this, I have no objection to 60/40 hp limits.

Re: Equestrian Management: Alternative B provides for 35 miles of newly designated trails while closing 65 miles of undesignated trails: this is a significant gift to horseback riders, most of who hopefully refrain from participating in riding their horses in the undesignated trails. Those who feel that National Parks entitle them to ride wherever they choose irrespective of the ecological impact will of course be unhappy. My only concern is that large number of horses- upwards of a thousand or more at times- will still be crossing the rivers. The recommendation that riders are given to stop their horse 100 feet from the stream to allow it to defecate and urinate prior to crossing hardly seems sufficient to prevent stream water contamination- shouldn't riders be required to use muck bags if they intend to cross streams? Park Service rules call for burying human waste at least 100 feet from water or trails: why doesn't the same rule apply for horse waste? I suggest as an alternative to muck bags that the Park Service aggressively monitor streams for bacteria: if a danger surfaces, all activity (horseback riding, canoeing, motor boating, etc.) should be prohibited until the waters are again safe.

Vehicular access: Keeping vehicles off of gravel bars makes sense. Missouri State laws ban vehicles from the rivers (except at designated crossings) and in many ways gravel bars are part of the rivers: they often are underwater! Much of the conflict between recreationists is a result of vehicles driving onto the gravel bars and using the bars for making spins, thereby. Vehicles also allow loud music (via car stereos), to say nothing of large containers of alcohol, to be brought onto the gravel bars.

As to road access, it is certainly extremely important that undesignated roads and river crossings be closed and that law enforcement be increased. The ONSR is a National Park, not a national racetrack. Those who argue for keeping open all the current illegal entry points are asking that crime be condoned. I note that Alternative B calls for opening 20 new designated access points: this is more than generous! Those who complain that the NPS are trying to keep the public from entry into the ONSR obviously have not read the Draft Management Plan.

Regarding the proposal to allow mountain biking on some hiking trails, I prefer that this be deleted from all Alternatives. I have no objection to mountain bikes on vehicle roads, but their use on hiking trails is a problem: inevitably, the trails widen and for those hiking it can be difficult to quickly move aside for a fast-moving bicycle. I realize that mountain biking is a popular activity elsewhere, but I do not think it is appropriate to encourage it within the Park.

Caving: In view of the escalating numbers of White Nose Syndrome cases in Missouri, I am glad to see that recreational caving is not being encouraged. Further, caves are a very delicate habitat and deserve the same protection as do archeological sites. Only persons trained in safe caving techniques should be allowed entry, and even that should be made secondary to wildlife protection.

Big Springs Wilderness Management: The proposal for wilderness management of the Big Springs tract is a good idea. I was surprised at the Van Buren meeting by the vociferous objection, but I heard no explanation other than opponents dislike and fear the federal government- that is hardly a rationale but instead a statement of one's mental status. I worked in mental health and I understand that people can get alarmed needlessly by all sorts of things, which seems to be the case here. The Big Springs tract is already managed mostly as wilderness and the only change would be that a few man-made items (the training range and a cesspool) would be removed, and a road already closed to the general public would be enclosed to Park officials as well. As I understand the proposal, that



road could be made into a hiking trail which would encourage greater visitation than is currently happening.

Conclusion: In summary, I support Alternative B with a few changes as recommended above. The "No Action Alternative" is really a prescription for continued and escalating problems in the Riverways. The National Park Service recognized the 1984 Plan has long been outdated and they are to be complemented for coming up with reasonable alternatives in the Draft Management Plan, any of which would be preferable to continuing on with current host of problems. I hope the discourtesy shown towards the NPS at the Van Buren meeting will not be viewed as a wide-spread sentiment: I truly believe most of us who choose to live in this magnificent area appreciate what the NPS does to preserve and protect it for we the people and for all the wildlife.

Sincerely,  
Susan Hagan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2873    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** Local folks (not employed by NPS) are the ones that rescue people in distress on the Current. They are also the ones that organize clean up of the rivers at end of season- -sometimes even giving rewards for the most trash collected.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2874    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,18,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** December 18, 2013

The Salem Area Chamber of Commerce requests the comment period for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan Draft be extended an additional 90 days beyond the February 7, 2014 deadline.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways provides tourism experiences that have a significant impact to our economic bottom line similar to Eminence and Shannon Counties. The combined impact of the ONSR on this region is significant. The Current and Jacks Fork rivers have provided jobs and recreational opportunities for our community. We are concerned with unemployment and poverty in our community and are looking at ways to continue and expand opportunities for local employment.

The Salem Chamber appreciates opportunities for our area citizens to comment through the public information and comment meeting scheduled for January 8th and asks you consider providing a similar opportunity to citizens in or near Shannon County. Our natural resources are an important feature in our community and we understand the National Park Service has extended significant effort to develop resource plans to sustain the park system. Our board hopes you look forward with patience and understanding as our local communities attempt to understand and return viable comments on your Draft Plan regarding our future water assets.

Most Sincerely,  
Salem Chamber Board  
The Salem Area Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors

Scott Roberts, President

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2875    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,19,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** Three years ago, my family decided to go to Powder Mill and travel up river for a change. We normally put in at Log Yard and go down. We put our boat in and there was a man, his wife, and son who was maybe 18 months-2 years old. He was kicked back in a lawn chair watching his child and his wife was sunning and walking back and forth to their vehicle that was parked at the edge of the gravel bar by where the road ends. We did our boating and came back and they were still there enjoying the day... So I thought. I noticed an older heavy-set woman close to

him wailing her arms and looking like she was getting excited about something. He just stared out into the water. We backed our vehicle in and I waited in the driver's seat as my husband loaded the boat. The woman then threw her hands in the air and began to flop over my way. The man continued to not budge from focusing on the water. As she approached me, I realized she was blabbing about the man who parked his vehicle on the gravel bar, while the sign clearly states NO PARKING. Here I am, sitting in my old K5, backed into the water, while we load a boat. My children are here. His children are here. And she was just showing her butt. About how that man was eroding the land and breaking the law. Still I sit there, backed into the water. I was appalled by her behavior and I could only assume she was drunk, but I don't really think she was. Those were her true colors. Finally I asked her, "Really, ma'am, where are you from?" She replies, "Illinois."

"Ah," I say. "That explains it!"

She groaned and flopped some more and finally walked away. After she was out of sight, the man finally spoke up, "There's idiots everywhere you go on this river anymore!" To this day I regret not getting this mans name and shaking his hand for sucking it up and taking that woman instead of stooping to her level. I regret not giving her a piece of my mind. THIS is why I am angry. THIS is why I resent you, National Park Service! You rip the land from my family decades ago and continue to allow people who might come down here once every 5 years to tell us how to use our land. Yes, this is a National Park. But you are not taking into consideration our rights as locals and the main source of revenue for this area. DO YOUR JOB, then you wouldn't have to worry about writing a 500-something page draft over the course of a few years, Lord knows how much this has cost us. What, with false E. coli studies and wasted research money. You have continued to step on our toes and we will not stand for it anymore. Current river is restricted more than enough as it is. Leave us be. This isn't a fight we will back down on.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2876	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Ozark Heritage Project				
Preservation Restoration Inspiration					
Comments, Revisions and Suggestions for the ONSR General Management Plan					

## INTRODUCTION

This set of comments and recommendations is the sole responsibility of the president of the Ozark Heritage Project's president Dr. Eric "Rick" Mansfield. It is being written after literally hundreds of interviews with those that visit the ONSR, some locals tracing their residency back more than a century and others that were first time visitors from out of state. OHP has spent more than a thousand dollars and at least that many hours trying to facilitate civil and constructive conversation concerning the development of the new General Management Plan that will guide the oversight of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for the foreseeable future. We have held additional opportunities at computer labs at Salem and Eminence, soliciting 3 7 comments at the first and two dozen at the second. We have distributed more than three thousand comment forms in a five county area, another two thousand flyers bringing attention to the comment period and appeared on a dozen radio stations. We have hosted a Trivia Night in Ellington to bring attention to the issues, provided a free Fish Fry and Boat Rides Saturday, January 4, at Pulltite to give businesses, other organizations and any interested visitors the opportunity to experience firsthand motorized jonboats on that stretch of river. We organized the Boat Rally at Powder Valley and provided the shuttle bus for the convenience of all visitors there.

OHP has been responsible for numerous newspaper articles to enlighten people about legitimate concerns of the present and past management of the ONSR as well as genuine apprehensions of visitors to the area. OHP was founded with the goals of preserving and restoring the physical environment of the streams and lands surrounding them as well as the culture of the people that evolved there, and to inspire others to do likewise. OHP has hosted the Current River Power Team's annual river clean-up this past year and participates in several others every year. OHP has conducted numerous stream cleanings along with cleaning up several land sites. We have published a book "Kids, Crafts & Christ: A Collection of Games and Things" in an effort to preserve traditions that entertained pioneer youth and often helped to prepare them for adult responsibilities; we have another book coming out this summer "A Riverman's Legacy and Other Ozark Tales."

Last year in 2013, OHP co-hosted the Haunting in the Hills event scheduled at Alley and just this January 31 of 2014

ONSR Chief of Interpretation Faye Walmsley approved OHP's "planning, coordinating and conducting Heritage Days in June and Haunting in the Hills in October." OHP looks forward to a long mutually beneficial relationship. It is with that intention and belief that we are submitting this modified Management Plan.

For ease of integration, we are following the same format as Alternatives A, Band C as well as the No Action offered as a baseline. We believe these recommendations to be extremely implementable. In some instances, there will be explanatory commentary at the end of a section. These are to be viewed as observation for the sake of increased understanding; not as criticism, though they are often not flattering. These are to better appreciate some of the animosity that unfortunately has led to nearly a half century of gridlock. It has been said that "The farther back you can look, the farther forward you are likely to see." It is with Churchill's observation in mind that these comments for reflection will be added.

Again, numerous people were consulted. Law enforcement from several agencies. Environmental groups. Hunting clubs as well as the sponsors of fishing tournaments. Guides from the old days reminiscing of nostalgic days gone by; canoe concessioners struggling in a new and ever challenging market. Church leaders as well as educators. Hikers along with horseback riders. This input was funneled through four decades of personal experience and a strong passion for the region and the culture.

We hope that this document can serve as a blueprint on which a new era of cooperation and stewardship might be built. Throughout this process of development, as with other interactions with the ONSR staff, we have found them to be cooperative and pleasant with which to work. Superintendent Bill Black and Deputy Superintendent Russ Runge in particular have been quite receptive to questions and suggestions and I believe them sincere in their desire to create new partnerships and develop a better opportunity for all visitors to the riverway.

## ZONING

If in fact, a new zoning is required, we would propose the less restrictive zoning parameters as defined in Alternative C. It was a bit disappointing that the data of current zoning was not included, even if only as a baseline and not a selectable option. Though the deadline for comments ends February 7, OHP reserves the right to supply additional data in the time immediately following this submission. Word of this report has generated more interest from outside entities than was at first anticipated, and numerous copies will be distributed to them as well. Any significant additions will be forwarded. You may consider them or not.

This is just one example of the ambiguity and noticeable omissions represented in this report. There has been a great deal of confusion about appropriate responses to the draft. Some of this might have stemmed from the roll out of options a few years back when "No Action" was an acceptable option. This confusion has most recently been manifested by such legislative actions as HR 8 and HR 9 which were resolutions in our Missouri House of Representatives calling for No Action. The confusion is further aided in that in the Draft General Management Plan itself, there is constant reference to the No Action Alternative (pages i and 37 for example). Other confusion existed about the format of the meetings. Literally hundreds of visitors came to Open House events believing there would be some interaction on a larger scale.

## VISITOR EXPERIENCES AND ACTIVITIES

The ONSR should be managed to preserve as well as when possible increase the recreational opportunities within their boundaries, particularly when such activities are a significant part of the cultural heritage the establishing legislation stated it would preserve. These would include social gatherings and family oriented activities; certainly floating motorized and non-motorized, basically un-restricted hiking and horseback riding. Any and all restrictions are a deprivation of someone's liberty, and should only be done upon the documented establishment of environmental need, such documentation consisting of the inclusion of an unbiased collection of data and the consideration of least intrusive options. One individual's desire to enjoy solitude at their convenience should not be justification to limit and exclude the enjoyment of others. I enjoy fishing when the rivers are not crowded; hence I do so in the winter. I occasionally enjoy the quiet serenity of the springs. I visit them at night or off season.

### River-based Recreation

OHP proposes that current rules be modified as following:

- 1) Implement a 90/65 motor size for above Van Buren to Two Rivers on Current River.
- 2) Implement a 60/40 motor size from Two Rivers to Highway 19 Bridge at Round Spring (more recognizable boundary) on Current River.
- 3) Implement 40/25 motor size from Highway 19 Bridge at Round Springs on up on Current River. The river will take care of how far; it will regulate itself.
- 4) Implement 60/40 from Two Rivers to Eminence on the Jack's Fork River.
- 5) Implement 40/25 above Eminence on the Jack's Fork River. Again, the river itself will regulate boat traffic in these areas.

Such restrictions would be more than adequate to assure safety and environmental integrity on the river. As to safety issues, a seasoned veteran law enforcement officer of the Upper Current will attest that "for every bad example I have heard a hundred comments about the 'unknown' boat operator who prevented drownings, exposure to the elements, recovered gear and equipment, and assisted floaters in some manner." Such a ratio by a seasoned observer would strongly suggest that elimination of these watercraft and their operators would in fact put more visitors in harm's way. It might be said, it would leave people in distress "up the creek with only a paddle."

The NPS logs incidents of inappropriate behaviors concerning motorized watercraft. There needs to be implementation of a record keeping process for compliments as well. As to those isolated "bad apples," a more visible presence of law enforcement officers along with enforcement of existing statutes such as 306.125 which addresses "Failure to operate watercraft in careful and prudent manner; Failure to operate at a rate of speed so as not to endanger others; Failure to exercise the highest degree of care; ... " Commonly referred to as the "highest degree of care" statute, it's fairly broad parameters should certainly enable law enforcement to address any and all true safety violations.

Positive steps that could and I believe should be taken also include the following:

- 1) Establish Trophy Smallmouth Bass Zones on both Upper Current and Upper Jack's Fork Rivers. This would enhance fishing for purists, spread the season out and quite possibly create guiding opportunities. Possible cooperating partners would include the Missouri Department of Conservation as well as the Missouri Smallmouth Bass Alliance.
- 2) Expand trout fishing on Current River with releases increased in volume, frequency and distribution area. With Pullite Springs and Fire Hydrant Springs above and Round Springs right below the warmer water from Sinkin Creek; it is feasible to stock trout certainly to the Mouth of Sinkin. A study in the 1970's indicated they could easily survive downstream as far as Grassy. Again, this would expand the areas for trout fishing and extend the season. Local fishermen and families would be pleased, it would be one more attraction for tourists and very likely extend the tourism season. It is probable that this too could lead to the creation of guide services. A possible partner would be the Missouri Trout Fishermen's Association which has chapters in Springfield, Kansas City and St. Louis.

Both of the above speak to the economics and the cultural heritage of an area that is experiencing both financial strife and cultural dissolution. Guided float fishing was a way of life decades before the Congressional Act in 1964 establishing the riverways. The probable extension of tourist seasons as well as the development of a cottage industry such as guided trips would serve to restore the rich heritage of free running Ozark streams unfortunately eliminated by the dam construction on other Ozark streams in the past century.

Access points could and should be dramatically improved, without a doubt expanded in size and very possibly increased in number. These were designed in the 1960's when there was approximately 50% of the concession canoes and only a fraction of the private canoes and kayaks entering and departing the rivers today. The ONSR's lack of management in this area has actually led to the creation of an illusion of being overcrowded because of the congestion at these focal points. The gravel bars themselves have been dramatically decreased in size. Please compare photos from just two to three decades ago. When the NPS/ONSR substantially increased canoe and inner tube allotments for concessioners and did NOT increase launch and take out accesses they set the public up for frustration and conflict.

Access points should be expanded and hardened to create high quality efficient access for both concessioners as well as private watercraft. Once constructed, they should be properly maintained in a timely manner. County Commissions should and could be partnered with to make this happen.

Address the "party" atmosphere. Many, myself included, do not visit the rivers during summer Saturdays because of the drunkenly and obscene behavior going almost unaddressed because of the lack of law enforcement presence.

#### Land-based Recreation

We encourage the development of new hiking trails as well as the identification of discovery sites. We do not believe this should be done by road closures, as experience has taught me that both horse trails and primitive roads can already be hiked. As to horse trails, there should be more of an effort to maintain existing trails. Again, private clubs and groups should and could be approached to make this happen. I, as did many others, took offense at a governmental institution wishing to discourage "social trails." Unless totally misunderstanding this terminology, it appears almost contradictory to our First Amendment right of assembly.

To address the impact of horses in significant numbers and to decrease their environmental footprint (hoof print?), numerous horse owning volunteers stand ready at their own personal expense to build Rest Stations complete with wooden hitch rails and rustic wooden benches for both horse and rider to rest above and outside the flood area of the rivers. ONSR staff need only identify areas for construction and approve rudimentary designs. At this time, OHP stands ready to place these plans into operation for the main part of the 2014 riding season.

Often, the multiple roads for all types of vehicles have been the result of one road NOT being properly maintained. Multiple roads/paths arise as earlier ones become impassable. Again, County Commissions and private citizens could be approached for assistance.

The ONSR/NPS should work with the Missouri Department of Conservation (MDC) to implement policies reflective of the Open Fields Management Plan that was instituted in the 1960's and '70's. I know that they are already conducting such projects on the lower parts of the river to increase elk habitat, so the precedence is already there. These were extremely popular with sportsmen and visitors, as they opened up the river bottoms for more esthetically pleasing visages along with bolstering the opportunities for floaters and hikers to view native wildlife. Such efforts would again increase tourism having a positive impact on the local economies.

Possible partners in such efforts would include local sportsmen (in the 1970's I myself put in numerous acres of wildlife plots on the Upper Current) as well as both state and national organizations. The National Wild Turkey Federation has a new program called "Save the Habitat, Save the Hunt" that is expanding their focus to include upland game. The NWTF has chapters all over this state and in the surrounding states as well. Field management for quail alone would bring the return of a significant number of visitors who hunted these fields in the '60's and '70's. Hunters who rented motel rooms, purchased gas and groceries.

As to plans to develop increased campgrounds at Akers, that is a good idea. The question is, "Why was the Akers campground closed in the first place?" The answer at the time was there were not funds sufficient to maintain it, including mowing costs. Right now, it is an eyesore; despite the nice new building. Unfortunately, much of that concession area is an eyesore-from either side.

Concerns in the area of recreation are multiple. The "management by neglect" that took place throughout most of the 1980's and '90's took its toll on both the resource itself, the behavioral patterns of visitors and the trust between the ONSR as well as between diverse usage groups. We concede that things are improving, but too much still appears to be on paper and not in practical application. Myself being a non-drinker, it is perhaps easier to recommend that alcohol be banned. Short of that, I do find it ironic that back during the previously mentioned period, when the NPS identified alcohol as the main source of problems and then within months approved the sale of alcohol with ONSR boundaries. To date, the most consistent and prevalent complaints are alcohol related and the NPS apparently has chosen to continue alcohol sales and to NOT further restrict the container size limitation of four gallons. Again, I know this is a state restriction but could not the NPS add further restrictions?

A consideration by our legislature might be to revise state statutes to the equivalent of those that apply to impounded waters. That is to revise the law so that the third DUI given on either of these rivers to a boat operator would constitute a felony, not simply another misdemeanor. As will be addressed again later, a more visible law enforcement presence would be of significant help.

#### VISITOR SERVICES AND FACILITIES

The quality of the canoeing experience at many concessions has been decreasing for years; a study of the percentage of returning customers would identify problem areas. From interviews and firsthand experiences, along with poor enforcement of the existing laws and regulations, the decline coincided with venues going from small Mom and Pop operations to the creation of mini-conglomerates. Even with managerial best efforts, there were no longer the bonds that had been growing between customer and operator, including almost familial relationships with drivers. When I drove in the late '70's and the '80's, families often requested the same driver year after year. We knew each other by first name. As operations were combined and enlarged, this degree of personal consideration and alignment became much more difficult to maintain.

New visitor services would augment the economy and possibly spread the consumer load. Before drunkenness became the norm, which has been for quite some time, many families expressed a real interest in other activities. Restoration of events such as whiskey making (or at least a demonstration of the process without the final product) and sorghum cooking would be welcomed attractions, as would increased blacksmith demonstrations.

As to facilities, increased oversight of expenditures is a must. As past performance is often the best indicator of future behaviors, there are troubling facts coming to light that only add credence to other examples of former mismanagement. Facilities, when needed, should be more representative of Ozark architecture.

Only recently has it come to light the more than \$300,000 per year rental agreement the NPS entered into in 1999. The 20 year agreement will come to an end barely five years into the execution of this new management plan. This is endemic of the type of governmental waste that should no longer be tolerated by tax payers at any level of government. For comparison, in 2001 I was superintendent of a public school where we built an even larger facility for approximately \$800, 000 total-a little more than two and a half years rent on the ONSR headquarters!

The desire to add an educational facility to their infrastructure is ironic considering the beautiful and fairly well maintained rock school house at Cardareva. Originally there were Steering Committees called for that I have heard actually met in the early years. Those should be reinstituted immediately; should have been part of this process. An Advisory Committee consisting of representatives of the various groups and stakeholders should be formed and listened to on a regular basis. It appears that one of the reasons such gridlock and perpetual conflict has come to exist in this riverways is the elitist thinking that borders on intellectual arrogance that only NPS personnel know what is best for the area, and even this is compounded by the lack of consistency in both their planning and implementation. Such an advisory committee would have the added bonus of introducing true synergy (the recognition that rather than seeking compromise where parties are asked to give up something, alternatives might be found that had never yet been considered-it is the force behind most modern breakthroughs in medicine and technology) into the planning process.

Another at least perceived problem is a lack of passion for the land itself, as well as its native people. Too often Park Rangers have been all too willing to exercise their authority but reluctant to accept potential responsibility. A glaring example is the fact that for almost a decade there have been three major stream clean-ups on the two rivers with NO significant NPS presence. The rest of us can volunteer our time to do what many might argue are their jobs. Notable exceptions are Supt. Black's visit to this past year's Current River Power Team (now part of the OHP) clean-up and Deputy Superintendent Runge's work with native woodworkers. Positive trends include those NPS personnel that consistently involve themselves in such community efforts as volunteer fire departments and pie suppers.

## INTERPRETATION AND EDUCATION

This would be a further step in the right direction, but again the aforementioned perception of NPS superiority rears its ugly head. Why must all guided tours be "Ranger led?" Why not call upon local resources and develop a cadre of volunteers/local contacts that have an intimate knowledge and historical perspective of local treasures within the ONSR? Why not the same as a bridge into our public and private schools?

I have firsthand knowledge of being that have offered their services for free and either been turned down or placed on perpetual bureaucratic hold. In fairness, both the superintendent and the deputy superintendent have taken some steps to improve this. There is still great room for improvement. OHP would be very much interested in assisting with the development of a school curriculum. Just in its president, you have access to a person with four college

degrees in education, three decades of teaching experience and curricular development experience in both public schools and our Federal penal system. There should at the very least be a feasibility study done as to the conversion of the school building there being returned to educational purpose.

## NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

I believe it important that it be remembered that the NPS did not purchase a "wild river system." Nor was the intent of the establishing legislation the creation of one. Current River and Jack's Fork had agricultural communities that should have been part of the preservation. We had then and still have knowledge of agricultural practices that are complimentary of environmental preservation and wildlife support. The Open Fields Management Plan should be revisited and again implemented. Organic based no till cultivation is quite feasible (we are in our eighth year on our farm in Reynolds County) and congruent with established environmental practices. Native grasses and shrubs are extremely self-sustaining and attract both wildlife and tourism.

## CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

This should be emphasized in both planning and practice. I believe much of the animosity that unfortunately is all too prevalent originated in the destruction of home sites and iconic structures for no good reason, and is only compounded by the remaining denials of such tragedies. There needs to be a readily accessible inventory of what historical sites and structures still exist and it needs to be reviewed by the previously mentioned Advisory Committee. A better job of identifying family cemeteries needs to be done, with assurances that people can readily access such sites. For example, the Bland Cemetery across from Spring Hollow on the Current River is barely accessible by boat or by County Road 534 which the ONSR has considered shutting off. The same is true of the Reed Cemetery on Trail 25.

A current example of continued denial is the comment by a NPS staff person on the ONSR facebook page about the lodge at Round Springs. It did not "burn down." Its demolition was sanctioned by park personnel. Some of the recovered lumber is still on the Hughes Farm in Eminence, MO. Freeman and his son Frank tore it down. Admittedly, OHP knows all too well the difficulty of maintaining accuracy or controlling comment on such media. For the record, the misinformation did NOT come from their spokespeople or administration.

Both this as well as the management of natural resources speak to the destruction and degradation of a people's heritage. Whether by design or poor management, local people as well as visitors have witnessed the destruction and decline of too many structural treasures. Real effort must be made to reverse this trend. It appears that the management is becoming "top heavy" and that perhaps monies could be better spent. A step in the right direction would be an open invitation to reporters to attend and report on weekly NPS management meetings. I believe this would go a long way in addressing the public confidence issues. I know that at least two of the papers for which I write would be very interested in such coverage and improved transparency. Such reporting would also make the job of the Advisory Committee more effective.

## WILDERNESS

As stated at the hearing at Powder Valley, though I can see a possible economic benefit to Wilderness Area designation, an inherent distrust of the Federal government is blocking local support. At this point, it would appear that voluntary removal of the NPS training range and conversion of administrative roads to hiking trails should be considered.

## PARK OPERATIONS

As to the infrastructure, I believe involvement of an Advisory Committee along with media invitations to regular planning meetings would add both transparency and synergistic thinking into this process.

Several times this report has advocated a more visible law enforcement presence. I am not necessarily saying we need more personnel, though that might be the case. I do believe we need more efficient utilization of their time. I believe that supervisors themselves need to be in the field more so that they can better assess the situation as well as have opportunity to set the example. Last fall I witnessed Deputy Superintendent Runge remove a dead animal from a

pavilion as to not detract from a visiting family's experience. I am NOT suggesting custodial duties become a significant part of his responsibilities. I DO know from experience (superintendent of three different public schools) that such examples go far in changing an institutional culture. As I have heard consistent complaints from both locals and the Sierra Club as to the perceived mismanagement of the ONSR, the often expressed concern that the Rangers don't seem to want visitors, the expressions from six and seven year olds "to leave us alone"; a heartfelt three page plea from a retired teacher, a good man, who "no longer feels welcome in a natural treasure only a couple of miles" from his home- -time for a change in culture is here!

I believe a really good start would be the creation of something like a "110% Club " Instead of focusing on a Friends of the Park organization that would raise even more funds to be used, why not take a page from JFK 's iconic encouragement and NPS staff ask themselves what more they might be doing? ONSR/NPS staff could volunteer an extra ten percent in this time when services are being curtailed because of funding limitations. In these trying financial times, ONSR staff are well paid I am NOT saying overpaid, but well paid How better to show the public we are in this together than make and execute such a plan? Even if the administration cannot mandate such an effort, I know from experience- if the top does this subordinates will follow.

## PARTNERSHIPS

Throughout this paper numerous organizations have been mentioned that are available and willing to be partners. The majority I spoke with to confirm their support before including them. I believe better effort could be made to be accessible via the media. I know all too well press releases seem to go into internet black holes, that to get radio time I must initiate personal conversations with reporters and talk show hosts. Deputy Runge and I shared one such event. To create true partnerships, it cannot be only about what the other organization or business can do for the NPS/ONSR. Just recently, the ONSR has extended an offer, which we have accepted, to plan and help present the Heritage Day event at Big Springs in June and Haunting in the Hills at Alley in October. I hope that in turn OHP is allowed to increase their book offerings and opportunities for oral presentations.

The partnership that must be focused on are the stakeholders. I believe we have already outlined and specified projects and suggestions that not only should be included in the new General Management Plan, but that will stand on their own merit and could be implemented immediately. The formal comment period ends today. OHP reserves the right to submit specific concerns to ONSR/NPS staff on a continuing basis.

We will be sharing copies with other entities as requested, including our local, state and Federal elected representatives. Copies will also be going to the potential partners with whom we have already had contact. We greatly appreciate the ONSR's genuine request for comment and look forward to the dialogue we hope we have helped create. Along with this document are being submitted more than six hundred written comment forms that have in common the following concerns/beliefs:

- 1) We would like to see more done to preserve the traditional culture that was here prior to 1964.
- 2) Alternative B that the ONSR is proposing unnecessarily adds further restrictions with little or no empirical data for a basis. A more visible and active presence of Park Rangers along with broader resource based recreational zones would better address the growing number of visitors.
- 3) Any and all bans on motorized watercraft should be eliminated from whatever General Management Plan is adopted. In fact, present restrictions should be reviewed as to their necessity. The river reasonably regulates itself as to motor size and times of usage. The parties creating a specific safety hazard should be addressed individually under the multitude of present laws.
- 4) We applaud the decision to recognize 60/40 as 40 HP and wish that they continue to recognize 40/25's as 25 HP.
- 5) We wish that the NPS would do a better job of maintaining our access to the river, given the elderly and the disabled that are wholly dependent upon such physical accesses.
- 6) We wish that the staff of the ONSR would increase their efforts to reach out to horse and boat owners to increase their usage and resolve whatever conflicts might actually exist.
- 7) We believe the GMP as presently put forth exceeds the scope of policy and is actually prescribing regulations, and doing that somewhat ambiguously.

The preceding comments were part of a generic form developed after literally hundreds of interviews and are just part of OHP's efforts to facilitate civil and constructive conversation.



We appreciate this opportunity and welcome any questions.

Respectfully submitted February 7, 2014

Eric Rick Mansfield  
President, Ozarks Heritage Project  
701 CR 602  
Ellington, MO 63638

(573) 663-2269  
emansfield2004@yahoo.com

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2877    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** Make no changes. Give the Rivers back to the people. Our access is limited enough. Camping on the rivers is becoming a thing of the past. We respect our rivers and are capable of taking care of them as well as teaching our children and grand children to respect our rivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2878    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** You have more than enough control of our rivers now. Local people need to keep the access they have. Our recreation on the rivers should not be controlled by the NPS. Give the Rivers back to the people.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2879    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** Tourism is a staple of our local economy, which relies heavily on our local rivers. We, "locals", have more than proven our respect for, and ability to care for, our rivers. Generations have grown up on these rivers, and to take away our access to them is akin to taking away our own histories. Our rivers are meant to be enjoyed and used, not viewed from a distance like a museum exhibit. Control of the local rivers belongs with the local people.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2880    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,08,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** My comments on Scenic Riverways Draft EIS I have to say, is since I live in this area, Eminence, MO. I'm retired, and farm raise cattle. I was born here in Dec. 28, 1928: So I've seen a lot" The better was in the 30's, 40's, 50's, 60's, 70's. But things in the last 20 years or so, I find and see too much conservation Park Service involvement.

Another thing that's a bother or frustration, is too many employees, and probably management; it seems like every employee has a vehicle: I think we could get by with half the force: and half of vehicles; our country is deep in debt. So a down size would really help. So when you draw up a draft, be sure that it's what all the live in the area want.

When you have the good will of us folks it will make your job a lot easier. Don't be hateful towards residents, that's lived here about all their lives. But I know there has to be rules, we all know that. Never try encroachment. This is mostly private property and we will keep it that way. No government land grab. This is America.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2881    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,01,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Since protection/stewardship of our resources is imperative it was with relief and approval to read the alternative plan your organization has chosen to uphold.

Please know you have the support of my husband, my mom, and me in this approach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2882    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Superintendent ONSR,

I am a farmer and landowner on the headwaters of the Jacks Fork. I have spent many days on the Riverways since 1977, poling and paddling a canoe upstream from Greseneck to Montauk on the Currant River, winter hiking along both sides of the Kacks Fork from Buck Hollow to Alley Spring, and exploring bluffs a hollows along both rivers. I have also participated in annual Stream Team cleanups on the ONSR.

I know these rivers, I know this park. I have seen the damage done to ONSR by:

1. Too many access points
2. ATV traffic on gravel bars
3. Bank eroding, polluting horses
4. Noisy, polluting, wake producing powerboats.

I favor Alternative A as it is most likely to stop the degradation of the ONSR Park, I also support the nomination of Big Springs Natural Area for Wilderness Designation.

Ted Berger

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2883    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black,

I am a member of the Ozark Wilderness Waterways Club of Kansas City, Missouri. For a number of years I coordinated week-long trips for the club on the Current and Jack Fork Rivers. It became obvious through the years that a serious impact was occurring on these rivers by increased horse and people incursion, by river crossings by horseback riders and by increase access by vehicles. On one occasion on the Jacks Fork I was starting into a riffle in my canoe when a parade of horseback riders crossed in front of me; they surely should have seen me coming but I had to jump out of my canoe to keep from running into them. On another occasion on the Jacks Fork below Eminence we were having lunch on a gravel bar below the horse outfitter; a continuous string of riders crossed the river for approximately thirty minutes during our lunch. On the Current River we noted that many of the gravel bars that previously had not been used were being accessed by vehicles. I could continue to site examples but I feel these incursions were not intended in the original National Scenic Rivers plan.

I have studied the proposals for change and feel that Plan A would have the best chance of reversing the harmful effects. These rivers a truly a national treasure and should not be further spoiled.

George M. Chase

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2884    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** After attending several of your informative meetings regarding your proposed General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, I believe the absolute best option is the "NO Action Alternative". The "NO Action" plan is the most beneficial to all those directly affected by the use of the riverways: the local residents, businesses providing services in the area, and all visitors to the ONSR. There are currently sufficient rules and regulations in place to protect the environment and the riverways.

My wife, Shirley, and I have owned a cabin and property on the river south of Doniphan for over 25 years. We,

along with friends who also own property along Current River, enjoy motoring up to Big Springs, having lunch at the lodge there, and then floating and motoring back. We have done this regularly from spring to fall over the last 10-12 years. What a wonderful way to enjoy the beauty of one of Missouri's natural resources. And much of the river in the Big Springs to Gooseneck area would be seen by very few people if further restrictions were placed on the use of the riverway.

Canoeists, floaters, and boaters currently use the riverway with respect for each other. Occasionally, some canoeists or floaters will get in trouble in the faster areas or where there are root wads, but the boaters are very good about coming to their rescue. Without some of the boats with larger motors, some of these individuals would most likely have drowned before help could be summoned. We personally have a large motor and have helped many individuals in dire circumstances. Additionally, the larger motor at cruising speed creates less wake than most 60/40 motors which are the proposed limit for this section of the river.

During the summer, there is congestion on the weekends near Van Buren and Doniphan due to the large number of floaters and canoeists that visit the area using the local rentals. Proposing the change in the regulations to eliminate outboard motors on sections of the river will only increase the congestion in the above mentioned areas. And from September 15 through the end of January, new regulations would prevent fish gigging in large portions of the river. Again, this would cause congestion in the areas open to outboards and remove fish from the river in concentrated areas.

Missouri residents are the primary individuals that use the riverways and should have ability to determine the regulations for the areas that we use. Obviously, we want the river to always be there in its current pristine condition for our own enjoyment and that of our children and grandchildren. With all of the boaters currently using the ONSR, there is very little if any trash left on gravel bars or in the river. What trash is there is caused by canoes overturning, floaters losing items in the river and being unable to retrieve them, and occasionally items blowing out of a boat. But again, there are river clean up days where those using the river regularly will meet up and pick up any litter or items that have floated downriver in floods.

After speaking with several hundred people in the meetings that you have held regarding the ONSR, and after listening to our state and national senators and representatives on the subject, it appears that the "NO Action" option is the option favored by all. I respectfully request that you adopt this "NO Action" alternative.

Sincerely,  
Ray and Shirley Batton

Mr. Reynolds,  
We entered our comments on the ONSR website but someone at the meeting suggested we mail you a copy.  
Thanks,  
Ray Batton

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2885	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,23,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Greetings,				

Plan B is a compromise. It protects Wildlife, Natural Habitat, and allows Public Recreation. Truly a "World- Class Treasure". Tourist from all over the country visit this area, benefit from it, and bring important economic support, to the local Community.

Preserve it for Generations of Americans, forever.

Your positive support is appreciated by all.

Thanks for all you do.

Saint Louis Zoo

Charles H. Hoessle

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2886    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Please address each bullet point specifically:

## I. SUMMARY OF COMMENT

On behalf of the constituents from my district who use and enjoy the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) and depend on its local economy; and also on behalf of the tourists who come from all over the country, and even the world, to use and enjoy the Park, I write urging you to continue implementing the No-Action Alternative proposed in the Draft General Management Plan. The "No Action Alternative" is a continuation of management policies that have been used successfully for over thirty years, and would continue sound park management without threatening the Public's use and enjoyment of the rivers.

The other Action Alternatives proposed by the National Park Service (NPS) fail to conform to current statues on the federal and state level. Moreover, a No-Action Alternative is the best option because it is compatible with preservation, it is economically viable unlike the other alternatives, it has worked for thirty years and does not require overreaching by the NPS contrary to the other Action Alternatives. Therefore, a No-Action Alternative is the best course of action as it protects the natural resources of the ONSR while securing the property rights of those who depend on the local economy of the region.

## II. OFFICIAL COMMENT

### a. The Scope of the National Park Service Organic Act and the Wild & Scenic Rivers Act

The National Park Service Organic Act (Organic Act), under 16 U.S.C. Â§Â§ 1-4, established the NPS. The Organic Act directs the NPS to: promote and regulate the use of Federal areas known as national parks, monuments, and reservations...by such means and meaures as conform to the fundamental purpose of the said parks, monuments, and reservations, which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

This textual quote is commonly referred to as the "preservation/use mandate." The mandate seeks to balance preservation and use to determine the extent of permissible recreation on federally owned lands. The majority of citizens, and many of my constituents in the Eighth District of Missouri, contend that the enjoyment of national parks requires physical access. Therefore, the Act could not have intended "impairment" to be used in its broadest sense.

Fredrick Law Olmsted, Jr., the father of American landscape architecture, and Congressman William Kent insisted that the Organic Act contain an overriding statement of purpose that provided a type of mission statement as its guiding principle. See Symposium: The National Park System: The National Park Service Act of 1916: "A Contradictory Mandate?" (Deny 74). U.L. Rev. 575, 597 (1997). These men not only wanted to conserve the national parks, but they also wanted to ensure the parks received substantial public use, and therefore were not content with using an overly-expansive definition of "unimpaired" in the Act. Instead of using the language "unimpaired for future generations", Congress inserted the keywords, "for teh enjoyment of future generations." The term "enjoyment" reasonably requires access, and so long as roads, trails, public access points, hotels, campgrounds, administrative facilities, and other forms of entertainment are not unduly invasive, the public has a right to "enjoy" the national parks.

The Organic Act provides clear guidelines for any type of Draft General Management Plan that sets forth a comprehensive plan for a national park. Although the Secretary of the Interior is allowed to "make and publish such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or proper" (16 U.S.C. Â§ 3), the promotion and regulation of the various areas of the National Park System "shall be consistent with and founded in the purpose established by section 1 of this title, to the common benefit of all the people of the United States." See 16 USC Â§ 1(a-1). Thus, any form of comprehensive plan, including the one in question for the ONSR, must conform at a minimum with the balance of preservation and use that is expressly declared under the Organic Act. The NPS is not permitted to dismiss or unfairly undermine the recreational interests citizens have in the ONSR.

Moreover, the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (WSRS), created by Congress in 1968 and codified under 16 U.S.C. 1271, states: rivers of the Nation which, with their immediate environments, possess outstandingly remarkable scenic, recreational, geologic, fish and wildlife, historic, cultural, or other similar values, shall be preserved in free-flowing condition, and that they and their immediate environments shall be protected for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations.

Again, a fundamental requirement of "enjoyment" is use and access, and therefore, under the WSRS, it is imperative that the NPS give greater consideration to use and recreation when developing a final General Management Plan. Any action alternative that minimizes recreational interests in favor of preservation runs contrary to the plain language of the Organic Act and the WSRS which seeks to balance both.

#### b. Statutory Authority for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways

##### 1. Public Law 88-492

The ONSR was created not only to preserve the history and resources of the region, but it was also meant to provide for recreation and enjoyment uses as well. See Public Law 88-492. The law states that it was passed for:

the purpose of conserving and interpreting unique scenic and other natural values and objects of historic interest, including preservation of portions of the Current River and the Jacks Fork River in Missouri as free-flowing streams, preservation of springs and caves, and management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources thereof by the people of the United States ....

Thus, similar to the Organic Act and WSRS, the statutory authority for the creation of the ONSR was intended to ensure preservation along with the use and enjoyment of outdoor recreation. Neither interest is given greater textual weight than the other. The NPS must adhere to this statutory language by securing the rights of folks who visit and enjoy the ONSR for recreational purposes. Closing 20 public access points and preventing the use of motors on boats in certain areas is diametrically opposed to the intent and plain language of this Public Law because these measures place preservation interests far above the recreational rights of the folks who use the park. These arbitrary and burdensome regulations are not only inconsistent with the Public Law, but are potentially crippling to a local economy that depends on the access and use of the rivers for their businesses.

The ONSR includes 134 miles of clean and clear water, comprising large portions of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. Although the last comprehensive planning effort for the ONSR occurred in 1984, changes within the region have not been substantial enough to warrant any form of action alternative. Given the lack of adverse environmental changes, and the detrimental economic impact any proposed action alternative would have on recreational use of the ONSR, the best option is a No-Action Alternative which would continue to conform to the original purposes of the park: the preservation of its history and resources, and the protection of recreation and enjoyment uses.

##### ii. Missouri Revised Statutes Section 12.025

In 1965, one year after the passage and designation of the ONSR, the State of Missouri codified section 12.025 to incorporate the area ceded to the federal government comprising the Ozark National Scenic Riverways "for so long as this area is administered and maintained by the United States." See Â§ 12.025 (2). It also lists an exception explicitly stating: "Provided that no part of this section shall apply to the White River watershed." See Missouri Revised Statutes, Â§ 12.025 (3). This section raises multiple issues about the NPS's jurisdiction and administration of the ONSR:

(1) During the period of government shutdown the NPS and the Obama Administration continuously denied state requests to open and maintain the public use of National Parks. Missouri specifically requested to open and maintain the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for public use, and its request was denied. Thus, the Park Service chose to no longer "administer and maintain" the public use of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways during the period of government shutdown.

a. Please address specifically:

1. The Nature of the Federal Government's property interests in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, in light of the closure of the Park during the period of government shutdown and RSMo. 12.025.

(2) The second issue involves the attached map of the White River watershed (Watershed) produced as part of the failed attempt to designate the White River and its watershed as a National Blueway. As depicted on the map, it appears the ONSR falls completely within the Watershed. Thus, the regulation by the NPS of the ONSR through its Draft General Management Plan will inevitably apply to and impact the Watershed.

a. Please address specifically:

1. The Nature of the Federal Government's property interests in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, in light of its geographic location entirely within the WhiteRiver watershed.

c. No-Action Alternative as the Best Option

The No-Action Alternative describes how the ONSR has been and would continue to be managed without the implementation of an action alternative. The No-Action Alternative encompasses the 1984 general management plan, 1989 river use management plan, and the 1992 statement for management and uses these past plans and statements as a description for current management conditions. A No-Action Alternative is preferable because there is no evidence of considerable adverse effects to resources in the ONSR, and the other proposed alternatives are too restrictive of users' enjoyment of the park. Additionally, the other alternatives, including the one recommended by the NPS, lack sufficient economic analysis to measure the impact these action alternatives will have on recreation and the local economy. The Action Alternatives amount to overreaching, arbitrary, and capricious government action to confiscate the recreation and property rights of Missouri residents and visitors alike with no reasonable basis. Therefore, because the No-Action Alternative is compatible with preservation, the other alternatives lack sufficient economic analysis, and the NPS is overreaching their delegated authority with any of the other alternatives, the No-Action Alternative is the best option for the NPS to take.

1. Compatible with Preservation

Current forms of permitted recreation in the park are easily compatible with preservation. The NPS should not be afforded the right to impose its preservationist viewpoint on the people of Missouri and the millions of visitors that the park receives every year. This detrimentally impacts the local economy built to accommodate visitors with food, lodging, and entertainment; including canoeing, horseback riding, and camping. The closure of 20 of the access points on the river and horsepower limitations for boats would inevitably reduce the number of visitors the ONSR receives each year, stifling commerce and hurting the local economy in the process. Any Action Alternative would be an excessive demonstration of regulatory authority by the NPS, significantly disrupting the delicate balance of preservation and use as explicitly set forth in every piece of legislation mentioned above. The closure of 20 access points is an arbitrary and capricious action alternative to the current management practices that have sufficiently maintained the health and vitality of the ONSR region. Oftentimes, the use of boats on the

Current and Jacks Forks Rivers is the only means for some people to access the park due to disability or age. Aside from being excessive, arbitrary, and unnecessary, the closure of these access points on the river would threaten the access these folks have to the park and implicate their fundamental right to travel under the U.S. Constitution.

Under current management practices, the ONSR Park Staff is tasked with preserving the natural resources of the Park, and have done an admirable job of protecting the area's habitat. The discretion they have to exercise adaptive management approaches is more than sufficient to ensure the continued protection of the resources in the park to guarantee that any permitted recreational activities are compatible with preservation. These current management practices are consistent with the balanced approach between preservation and use as set forth in the statutes above. Thus, under the No-Action Alternative, unforeseen or emerging issues can be readily and effectively addressed by Park Staff when they arise.

#### 11. Lack of Economic Analysis

The Draft General Management Plan suffers from a lack of economic analysis, preventing the NPS from accurately gauging the economic impact of closing public access points, eliminating motorized boat traffic in certain areas, restricting boat motor horsepower, closing gravel bars, and designating new wilderness areas. Additional economic analysis is needed to determine the impact these changes will have on the local, state, and national economy. The cumulative effect of these changes is likely to lead to long-term, major, and adverse economic effects to commercial services and tourism in the Riverways. The conclusory economic results provided by the NPS are insufficient and require additional analysis and data to support their findings.

While the NPS evaluates each of the individual changes from the action alternatives to the ONSR (i.e. the closure of public access points), it is their cumulative impact that will likely create significant economic harm for the folks who depend on the economic vitality of the region. This lack of economic analysis is in direct contravention to the requirements of the Organic Act which explicitly calls for a balance of preservation and use considerations. Without sufficient economic data to support its conclusions, the NPS would be completely neglecting the micro and macro-economic effects that this General Management Plan will likely produce. Therefore, additional economic analysis is needed in order to conform to each of the statutes mentioned above.

Furthermore, I would also request that the National Park service specifically address the potential for the other action alternatives to change, limit or eliminate small business vendors and concessionaires from operating in the park

#### 111. De Facto Wilderness Areas usurp Congressional Authority

Each of the action alternatives offered by the NPS include management zones, which only apply to land areas where the NPS has fee title land ownership. I take contention with the NPS using these management zones as de facto wilderness areas in the Action Alternatives. By proposing additional areas for designation as federal wilderness, the NPS is taking an already over-managed region and employing additional measures that only serve to harm a local economy that has tirelessly worked to preserve the region since its creation as a demonstration park for the "Wild and Scenic Riverways" program. The authority to designate federal land as wilderness is clearly vested in Congress alone under the 1964 Wilderness Act. See 16 U.S.c. 1131. Thus, the NPS does not have the authority to prevent recreation or use of these areas without Congressional authorization. It does not have the power to create de facto wilderness areas from self-created management zones that have not been approved as wilderness by Congress.

Designation of the Big Spring area in particular would be a terrible act of overreach by the NPS. Under Action Alternative B, which NPS prefers, most of the Big Spring Wilderness Study Area would be recommended for wilderness designation. This action would severely threaten the private property rights of folks who have cabins and homes in the area. The removal

of telephone lines that serve these residences, access roads, and a fire tower are arbitrary and unnecessary changes to an already pristine and protected area. The confiscation of our local state forests by the NPS seriously infringes on private property and land use rights of the citizens of Missouri.

#### IV. Boat Motor Restrictions lead to safety / access concerns

Along with the proposed wilderness designations, the restriction of boat motor horse power in certain areas and the elimination of motorized boat traffic in others are capricious actions that serve no purpose aside from restricting fishing, trapping, gigging, guided float trips, and other forms of recreational activity on the rivers. Total elimination of motorized vessel access in the northern section of the park would eliminate recreational activities like gigging that have been historically performed in the park. Often, motorized vessels remain the best option to get injured visitors medical attention quickly and safely.

#### v. Closing Access points will be unnecessarily burdensome

Additionally, closing gravel bars will unnecessarily restrict camping activities to designated sites. Moreover, limiting public access points will severely affect the commerce generated by the rivers as the number of visitors will inevitably decline. In some instances, the closure of access points on one side of the river may increase travel time to an access point of forty-five minutes or more. These actions all serve as primary examples of the numerous instances of overreaching by the NPS in their proposed action alternatives.

#### VI. Horseback riding effectively managed under current practices

The tourism industry supported by horseback riding in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways provides visitors with a unique and irreplaceable opportunity to experience the park from a different perspective. The arbitrary closing of 65 miles of trails that have been widely used by the public under current management practices, with no concern for what economic impact that may have on the local economy, is an excessive solution for a non-existent problem. I urge the National Park Service to continue to manage horseback riding, and trails, in substantially the same manner as it is managing them now.

### III. CONCLUSION

In light of the concerns raised above, I urge the NPS to implement the No-Action Alternative as described in the Draft General Management Plan. It is the only proposed plan that conforms to current federal and state statutes, it is compatible with preservation, and it has proven to be economically viable for the last thirty years. Folks in Missouri's Eight District do not need the federal government to implement any additional regulations to govern their forests, streams, and rivers. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways has been a premier destination for tourists in Missouri, it is the lifeblood of the local economy, and it provides some of the best recreational opportunities in the region. The No-Action Alternative is the best course of action because it not only ensures that folks will be able to enjoy the region as they have for years, but that it will continue to be preserved as well.

I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Jason Smith

Member of Congress

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2887 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** This letter is in regard to the General Management Plan (GMP) in review for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR).



My 25 year career as a park interpreter began at Big Springs National Park in 1986. After working several other parks across the country, my husband and I chose to return to southeast Missouri, solely because of our personal connection to Current River and the ONSR.

For the past 24 years, when we seek solace, renewal or recreation, we turn to Current River. Floating, fishing, swimming, camping and hiking are favorite activities. Whether alone or with friends, Current River has been at the top of the list.

Unfortunately, severe overcrowding, extremely rude behavior of so many others, and resource degradation along the river have more recently limited our trips to "off" days and seasons, when we hope to avoid crowds and conflict. "Off" days are getting extremely difficult to find.

We were both so glad to see the National Park Service (NPS) proposing new management guidelines for the ONSR. We are also glad to see that all three alternatives offer at least some degree of protection for the resource. Without the resource, there will be no visitors at all.

While our first preference would be the most environmentally friendly (Alternative A), we understand that Alternative B provides protection and education/ interpretation. This option provides somewhat of a balance, a middle ground, between two very disparate groups. Since no single plan will satisfy all interested parties, a "compromise" may need to be made.

We hope that this compromise will still focus first and heavily on the resource. After all, the river is what draws in visitors. The better their experience, the better chance they will return.

The interpretation proposed in Alternative B is an extremely important component, which should ideally be included as part of all alternatives. Interpretation done well can ultimately lead to protection of the resource.

The proposed ecological restoration projects will allow use, while minimizing impact on the resource. Restoration of cultural structures and landscapes are also important, along with protection and management of areas possessing wilderness qualities. Properly-constructed trails can provide for horse and mountain bike use with minimal impact.

Silence and solitude are also resources to be protected, both on and off the river. Enforcement of regulations is crucial to maintaining these resources. Any development will hopefully take these resource concepts into consideration.

Again, we are pleased that the NPS has proposed alternatives for a new GMP, and that all have resource protection as a major component. If Alternative A cannot be adopted, then Alternative B would provide a reasonable balance, protecting the resource and enhancing visitor experience.

Thank you for your efforts,  
Janet Price  
Roger Price

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2888	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,27,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Fax				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Sir,				

I wanted to voice my support for the NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE choice on the ONSR Management Plan. After reading the management plans, I believe this is the correct action needed.

Jeff Bockman

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2889	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,24,2014 00:00:00				

**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sirs,

Below is my comment to the Draft General Management Plan that is currently open for comment.

**RECOMMENDATION:**  
My recommendation is the "No-Action Alternative"

**BASIC REASONS:**  
The first reason is because all 3 alternatives require more staff to manage the zones. Staffing has already been reduced because of funding cuts, so it does not make sense to put plans together that increase staffing levels. I am not in favor of increasing the size of government and creating more deficient spending.

The second reason is because all three alternatives eliminate approximately 65 mile of undesignated horse trails. The plans talk about creating 25 to 45 miles of additional designated trails, but did not indicate the area where they will be created. This is one of the most important items left out of the 3 plans. Most of the trails to be eliminated are in the Northern Boundary to Akers zone, which includes the Cedar Grove area. The Cedar Grove area is one of the most popular staging areas for horseback riding activities, yet the plan is going to eliminate all of the trails, with no assurance of the creation of new designated trails.

The third reason is the negative effect of the elimination of horse trails described in reason 2. If horseback trail riding is eliminated in this area, (Northern Boundary to Akers) it will create economic ruin for the three private horse campgrounds that depend on those horse trails. It will also create an economic hardship for all of the commercial businesses that depend on the many hundreds of horseback riding tourists, (many from out of state) that ride those trails.

**SOLUTIONS:**  
1st. Create a Community Volunteer Group to perform the necessary Equestrian trail work, in cooperation with the NPS.

2nd Designate and maintain 65 miles of sustainable horseback riding trails in the area mentioned above.

3rd Reroute and close unsustainable horseback riding trails.

4th Develop and implement a modest fee system for all trail users to help pay for trail improvements.

I personally know of 3 organizations and at least 30 people that would help with the solutions above. During the last 10 years, the equestrian community has become more aware of trail degradation, and how important it is to practice good land stewardship and LNT. These principles already have been demonstrated in the Rolla/Salem/Licking/Houston area in cooperation with the National Forest Service.

**CONCLUSION:**  
Follow the examples of the National Forest Service and other Missouri State Agencies, and form a Community Volunteer Group to perform the necessary Equestrian trail work. Do NOT eliminate this very important and economically viable recreational activity in the Northern Boundary to Akers area of the ONSR. Since nothing in the three alternatives has addressed the above issues, I have no option but to recommend the "No-Action Alternative".

Respectfully Submitted,  
Maury Mertz

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2890	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,24,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Sir:				

Tonight my husband and I attended the Draft GMP Open House held at our local city hall. We were somewhat

disappointed that this was not a meeting where plans were explained nor a time of open discussion. It was pretty obvious that, as with the introduction of elk by the Conservation Commission, everything was pretty much "cut-and-dried" like so many federal government decisions are these days, having little regard for the citizenry in general.

Your representatives were gracious and made information somewhat available. However, the lighting made reading of endless charts and posters very difficult and required standing for long periods, as did the wait for talking to representatives personally. We were able to talk to one NPS person at Station 7 of all the ones set up; he showed us the 3 possible plans of action and gave us a brochure.

We also were given a CD which we immediately brought home and read about the first 50 pages before it, too, became too exhausting and we turned to the brochure to see the charts of comparison. After all this time and effort expended, it is still very much our conclusion that the no-action alternative remains the best one. When we see government expansion to a huge extent, with less regard to the opinions or well-being of the people, with tax burdens increasing rapidly, and with executive orders ignoring the rights our Constitution guarantees, the people of our country and our state do not wish to see changes dictated to us by any federal agencies!

We are not against progress, but we are against widespread change that involves greater regulation and further taxation. We are lovers of nature ourselves, but to have people telling us how to use the natural resources with which our area is blessed does not appeal to us at all. Clearly, any of the other proposed plans involves a need for increased funding, which must surely come from further taxation or fees. We do not view the role of government as further expansion of land ownership or control, even "for the good of everyone," when our government clearly has shown it cannot control its own spending.

For all these reasons, we strongly urge the maintaining of the status quo for the foreseeable future as far as our scenic riverways are concerned. The no-action alternative would seem on IV to require a single regulatory change as to the power of boat motors. This would be far less costly, more sustainable, and far more citizen-friendly than any of the proposals offered.

Jessie Harris

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2891	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,09,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Superintendent Black,				

Please allow me to introduce myself. I am Gary Buchanan, President of the Shannon County Hunting and Fishing Club, Inc. The purpose of this letter is twofold. First, I wish to offer whatever assistance we may be able to provide in relation to the request for partnerships in the recent Draft Management Plan, and second, to request additional information relating to the details of the plan.

The SCHFC celebrated our 100 year anniversary in September of 2012, and throughout the past 100 years, our organization has enjoyed the natural beauty of the Jacks Fork River and the surrounding areas. There is mention of our organization on the ONSR website in the article titled Rymers Ranch and the Birth of the Ozark Riverways in the History & Culture section.

Our cabins along the river are now gone, and much of our original property between Rymers Landing and upriver to Meeting House Cave was incorporated into the ONSR, however we still own 169 acres bordering the ONSR on County Road O-C on the north side of the Jacks Fork. The membership of our club still enjoys the use of both ours and the park's property in this area.

After reviewing the proposed Draft Management Plan, we have a concern about statements in the plan regarding the closing of roads. We have reviewed the maps and zones provided in the plan in regards to how the area bordering our property would be categorized (Primitive, Natural, etc.). We believe, based on the maps the management plan, the ONSR property bordering ours would be zoned either Primitive or Natural, but the map resolution is insufficient to determine this. We would like to request any details available on how the Draft Management Plan may affect our area, and our access to the river. We specifically are concerned about any potential closing of the river access via

County Road o-c. I have attached a topographical map of the areas discussed here for reference.

Our organization is committed to the preservation and appreciation of the Jacks Fork River area, and we wish for us and our future members to continue enjoying this area for the next 100 years.

Please contact me using the contact information provided above.

Thank You,  
Gary Buchanan  
President

12/11/13 Dene spoke with Justin Buchanon - explained that County Road O-C would not be closed or impacted in any manner because it is a county road. Also encouraged them to pursue their offer for partnership following the finalization of the GMP.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2892    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** To Whom is May Concern,

The picture on this card says is all - a beautiful river, as it the Current R.

I am writing to support Plan B - I do not want to destroy the livelihood of the people on the river, but I do want to save the river. Some management is necessary - the gravel bars and spawning grounds are being damaged. E-coli levels are very high. Let's work together for a win-win situation, but foremost save the beauty and integrity of the Current River.

Sincerely,  
Judy Sung

Also a volunteer at the Mo. Wildlife Rescue Center.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2893    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Black,

Thank you for the opportunity to attend your open house regarding the National Park Service's Draft Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways held in Van Buren, Missouri, on January 21, 2014. I trust these comments will be accepted considering the numerous postponements to the public forums as a result of weather. I found the exhibits informative and the staff generally prepared to answer direct questions. I request this letter be entered into the official record and its' contents are carefully reviewed and considered for any changes or modifications that may be considered by the Government.

I have reviewed the documents regarding the Government's Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR), and wish to comment on several changes, these comments are contained below. I am a multi-purpose user of the area, actively fishing, hunting, boating, canoeing, gigging, camping (land and water based), and hiking. I am not an equestrian, therefore I will not comment on that portion of the Plan.

The Plan, particularly the Preferred Alternate B, mentions camping will only be allowed at designated locations. When I questioned your staff regarding this matter, I was informed selected areas (gravel bars) would be designated as areas to camp, picnic, and swim. They further informed me, the designated areas would be properly marked and would be made available to the public on a first-come first-served basis. I wish to formally oppose this portion of the Park Service's plan. This particular portion of the plan poses too many restrictions on the users, creates safety concerns, and may force user fees or visitor restrictions as the number of visitors will soon outweigh available designated locations.

Your plan also requests to limit outboard motors throughout the ONSR. There are several parts of these restrictions which cause me great concern. The first is the elimination of all motors above Pulltite and Rhymers, and the summertime elimination of outboards above Round Springs and Bay Creek. This will essentially eliminate all gigging, a strong Ozarks winter tradition, during the winter months and severely hinder anglers who wish to participate in the fantastic fishing opportunities via modern john boats. I am also concerned about the safety of canoers whom often bring along a small outboard motor to escape weather. These changes only satisfy a small group of canoers and kayakers, but bring undue hardships on many others leading me to strongly oppose these proposed changes.

A proposed change from Big Springs to Gooseneck (Carter/Ripley Co. Line) to limit motors to 60/40 may be acceptable to me as a user, however I have purposely equipped myself to fish, gig, and boat in the upper reaches of the ONSR and this change will not directly affect me. I do have concerns for those neighbors of mine which own and operate equipment larger than the 60/40 threshold. Based on these facts, I oppose this rule change.

The verbiage used in the Plan references "40 HP at Powerhead Year Round (60 HP with Jet Motors)". This is a strange statement considering the National Marine Manufacturers Association changed its' criteria from rating horsepower at the powerhead to the propshaft in the early to mid 1980's. Based on the verbiage in the plan, the Park Service is referencing technology approximately 30 years old, and if enforced verbatim, could result in nearly every outboard engine manufactured in the last 30 years being illegal on the ONSR. I strongly urge the Park Service to correct this error and specifically allow all engines rated 60 HP at the propshaft legal if equipped with a jet drive, whether installed at the factory or aftermarket.

The Plan also discussed the addition of a Congressionally Designated Wilderness Area in the vicinity of Big Springs. The immediate area has two Wilderness Areas, one on Mingo National Wildlife Refuge and the other at the Irish Wilderness. These two Areas are significant and were established by Congress due to their unique statuses. Mingo was designated based on the fact that it was one of the last remaining Bottomland Hardwood Forests in Southeast Missouri and the Irish Wilderness based mainly on the trials of Fr. Hogan and his parishioners. The area proposed near Big Springs contains very little, in any, historical or natural significance. The Big Springs area is currently managed as a natural area, and could remain nearly untouched through normal management practices by the Park Service without the Wilderness designation.

Further, as a Wilderness Area, the proposal near Big Springs leaves countless surrounding acres at severe risk to fire danger. A wildfire within the Wilderness Area would have to remain uncontrolled as a result of Congressional action. I strongly oppose any attempts to create a Wilderness Area in the vicinity of Big Springs not only for the possible dangers to the surrounding properties but the undue financial burden that taxpayers would suffer as a result of the proposal.

The fiscal impacts on the Plan, not included in the 22 page summary, were finally explained to me during yesterdays' meeting. I was shocked to learn that Alternate B increased the number of full time staff (FTEs) and the annual operating budget by nearly 35%, Alternates A and C were even higher. Increasing the operating budget by any amount is totally unacceptable to me as a user and taxpayer. I'm certain my concern is shared by the majority of the ONSR users. I am also opposed to the planned restrictions eliminating all motor vehicle traffic on gravel bars. Many of the affected gravel bars offer access to canoers, boaters, and other visitors. I do agree, some users have damaged these areas, but enforcement and minor improvements appear to be a better option. As written, I must oppose this portion of the plan.

In closing, I propose the National Park Service chose the NO ACTION option. The various alternatives, including the Preferred Alternative B, do not serve the immediate area. These alternatives may actually hurt our local economies and severely restrict our access to a resource we so dearly love. I trust these comments will be entered into the official record and carefully considered when a final selection for the new Management Plan is completed.

Sincerely,  
Stephen Bubanovich

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I would like to voice my support of the Alternative B plan for OSNR. This plan presents a nice balance between preserving the integrity of the exceptional natural scenery and resources that the Current and Jacks Fork river valleys provide and access by the public to enjoy these wonderful resources. There currently is too much noise and pollution from vehicular/ORV and motorboat traffic and too many undesignated horse trails across both rivers. These unauthorized vehicles and undesignated horse trails severely erode river banks, endangering both natural resources and archaeological resources.

Sincerely,  
Jack H. Ray

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2895    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent,

I believe keeping the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in its natural state is becoming uncontrollable. More restrictions are needed.

There are few riverways in the United States that are springfed, clear and freeflowing. The rivers and its tributaries are a major tourist magnet for Missouri.

In an attempt to prevent the streambeds and the tranquility of the environment from being disturbed, off-road vehicles must not be allowed near the streams.

Let's do whatever is possible to maintain the Ozark National Scenic Riverways as serene as nature left it.

Yours Sincerely,  
Earle F. Rimer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2896    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

I was raised on Current River until the Park Service FORCED us out! Our house burned in May 1969. It looked a lot better back then but it's all grown up now.

We enjoy our motor boats and canoes. We are on the river all summer long from Akers Ferry down to Round Springs. I am 65 years old I grew up on this river. I cannot ride in a canoe anymore. We pick up trash along the river and help with stranded canoes and assist with first aid if needed.

I attended the meeting in Kirkwood, MO on January 22, 2014. In my opinion, the Sierra Club has no right telling the property owners that pay taxes along or near the river how to live.

Current River is open to the public and welcomes visitors. But visitors need to respect the river and property owners too. Just as if anyone would visit another country and didn't like it then they wouldn't go back. You cannot force the culture to change, so why try to force the culture on Current River or anywhere in AMERICA!

We enjoy our motor boats, fishing, gigging, swimming, floating and sitting on the gravel bar watching canoes float down the river. The Sierra Club is entitled to their opinion and this is mine!

MARY SNYDER  
Property Owner  
Tax Payer  
Family History on Current River

Tradition

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2897 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Draft Management Plan for the ONSR. I had planned to attend the meeting on January 8th with a friend, but was not able to come because of the time change to evening. I hope to be brief in these comments.

My Background. Since moving to Missouri in the 1980s following retirement from the Air Force, my husband and I were thrilled to "discover" the ONSR with its beautiful rivers, springs and geological wonders. Through the years we had taken our children to many national parks and were delighted to find such a beautiful park here in our chosen state. We came many times to explore, float, and enjoy nature. Later, our children brought their friends to float and camp. In the summer of 2012 they came from other states with their own children for a reunion, floating the Current, staying at our favorite Rosecliff Lodge in Van Buren.

My Choice. I've read the summaries of all 3 management plans and appreciate the immense effort in planning that has gone into them. Although I lean toward Plan A, I feel that it is not practical to turn the clock back and attempt to restore the park as it was decades ago. Such a restoration, if it were possible, would be difficult to maintain. I would also reject Plan C in that it would open up too many new areas for use and visitation, and would likely result in increased noise and congestion.

Plan B, I believe, offers a worthy compromise and an effort to accommodate both those who prefer a quieter experience and those who view the ONSAR in terms of recreation only. I am thrilled as I read all of the new provisions in this plan! I would endorse it with one recommendation:

Motorized vehicles should be excluded from gravel bars. Our family has property on the Little Niangua River and one sees there how easily these fragile ecosystems of sand and gravel are disturbed by natural forces such as flooding, but also by cows crossing the river or motorized vehicles causing disturbance on the banks of the river and on the gravel bars.

National Parks have been set aside for us through the efforts of many citizens, naturalists, scientists, ecologists, politicians (presidents!) and others. They are, as it were, the gifts from the evolutionary forces of our planet. They belong to all of us, to care for, to preserve, for those who come after us.

Thank you, thank you, for your efforts to preserve the beautiful Ozark National Scenic Riverways!

Sincerely yours,

Barbara E. Yates

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2898 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Sir,

I grew up more than 80 years ago in Iron County, MO and visited the Current River when I was young and it was wild and pristine.

There are too many people loving this river and Jacks Form now for these streams to be enjoyed without regulation. I favor more regulation and think it will not damage the economy of the region.

I will add that I was a housewoman and I frequently rode horses into the local creeks which did no harm when there so few of us. But what was harmless then is not harmless now. Keep the horse manure out of the rivers.

Sincerely Yours,

Doris B. Pree

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2899    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

Much of the Current and Jack's Fork watershed is situated in counties that are part of our chapter's area of responsibility. The Current River and the Jack s Ford and their vast watershed are home to one of the most endangered bird species in Missouri- the Swainson's Warbler. We cannot over emphasis the importance of this watershed and the surrounding habitat to migrant species of birds that call the Ozarks home.

It is without reservation that we fully support the Alternative B proposal as proposed by National Park Service to immediately begin healing of an already damaged habitat. '

Thank you.

Respectfully yours in bird conservation!

Mike President  
President  
Ozark Rivers Chapter  
National Audubon Society

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2900    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I very much support the park service providing a high level of protection of natural & cultural resources, with some opportunity for visitors to float, canoe & kayak and ride bikes in the park. I would be somewhat reluctant to see expanded horse trails - as horses destroy trails more than bicycles. I believe some motorcycle trail use would be acceptable as long as they are well muffled (and perhaps limited to less than 900cc machines).

Overall though I wish the rivers would be mostly limited to paddle. Jet boats and jet skiis perhaps could be limited to a few sections.

But overall - let the Park Service have overall control to protect and limit this area as the professional staff desires. Also hunting & guns should be extremely limited in the park.

P.S.

It is unfortunate another hearing can not take place given the attempt (shown in the picture in the post-dispatch\_ to limit access to the Powder Valley hearing site by local (close to the park) residents. Particularly disturbing is that the Shannon County Sheriff's car with a large boat and trailer was used to block off the lot.

Thank you,  
John Saxton

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2901    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Ozark Nat. Scenic Riverways,

I would like to comment on keeping Federal Regulations on the Current Rover, Jacks Fork and Others.

These rivers need stronger Federal regulation to insure a clean environment for these areas.



There are too many boaters on these waters, too many horses and ATVs harming these riverways.

I have seen a steady decline of these areas.

Please keep strong regulations to protect our rivers.

Sincerely,  
Charles Hill

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2902    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent:

I'm writing to share my comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan (GMP).

I prefer Alternative A as outlined in the Draft General Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement.

For many years J have enjoyed the use of the Riverways in an appropriate fashion, canoeing and often camping on the rivers. We have brought visitors to the area and often comment on what a wonderful state treasure we have with pristine waters and beautiful scenery. However, in recent years we have worried about excess bacteria from large concentrations of animals and other abuses of the riverfront. Alternative A can correct these abuses without providing undue restrictions. This is a national park and, in all the national parks I have visited, there have been some restrictions to provide a safe, long lasting environment.

The 'No Action' alternative is unacceptable to me because it fails to address the need for more enforcement of existing laws and standards, to better manage overcrowding, and to improve communication and partnership with local landowners and communities. Further, it fails to address the conservation and preservation functions of the National Park.

The Current River and jacks Fork are prime recreational waters in a stunning natural karst area that attracts approximately 1.5 million visitors each year. A 2011 study estimated visitor spending at more than \$55 million with nearly 90 percent of spending from non-local visitors. As a unit of the National Park System, management of the Riverways must ensure protection of the Park's resources in an unimpaired condition for public recreation, education, and scientific value. Among its tasks is sustaining and restoring bio-diversity for the next generation.

Yours Truly,  
David Garin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2903    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir,

I urge you to adopt Plan A for the management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I have floated these streams for 40 years. Each year they show decline from too much use. If not protected now, their destruction is inevitable.

Thank you,  
W. Dudley McCarter

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2904    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

I was raised on Current River until the Park Service FORCED us out! Our house burned in May 1969. It looked a lot better back then but it's all grown up now.

We enjoy our motor boats and canoes. We are on the river all summer long from Akers Ferry down to Round Springs. I am 65 years old I grew up on this river. I cannot ride in a canoe anymore. We pick up trash along the river and help with stranded canoes and assist with first aid if needed.

I attended the meeting in Kirkwood, MO on January 22, 2014. In my opinion, the Sierra Club has no right telling the property owners that pay taxes along or near the river how to live. Current River is open to the public and welcomes visitors. But visitors need to respect the river and property owners too. Just as if anyone would visit another country and didn't like it then they wouldn't go back. You cannot force the culture to change, so why try to force the culture on Current River or anywhere in AMERICA!

We enjoy our motor boats, fishing, gigging, swimming, floating and sitting on the gravel bar watching canoes float down the river. The Sierra Club is entitled to their opinion and this is mine!

MARY SNYDER  
Property Owner  
Tax Payer  
Family History on Current River  
Tradition

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2905    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to express my support for Plan A which is the most protective of the streams. Although Plan B is designed to be a compromise, it is still destructive to our streams and heritage.

I own 120 acres in Laclede County with a half mile of river frontage on the Osage Fork. I have a vested interest in the protection of our streams, not only for myself, but my children and all of those who use our streams. I have enough difficulty keeping the ATV's off of our property, and can only imagine what would happen to our section of the Osage Fork if we had ATV's running across the river.

We were considering donating our land to the Ozark Regional Land Trust, however in view of the plans you have put before the public for discussion and a vote, we will certainly not consider a donation if you adopt anything other than Plan A for our streams.

Sincerely,

Steve Miller

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2906    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Bill and Russ,

Please accept the following as my comment to the draft GMP.

I applaud the NPS for taking consideration in keeping the National Scenic Riverways pristine for future generations to continue to use. As a young father I hope to have the opportunity to raise my children as I have enjoyed the nature that surrounded my home.

However, I have some issues with the direction that the GMP is taking, in an effort to preserve this beautiful place.

As a business person in the local community I ask if there was any consideration the local economy that the GMP will have in the rural areas surrounding the Riverways. Not only is the Federal Government responsible to preserve the land and water that park includes inside its boundaries, it has a responsibility to people who have lived their whole lives to provide an economy that is sustainable to raise a family.

Our Constitution properly gives rights to citizens of the United States of America, and in doing so the Constitution should protect those rights. It is those rights that should not limit the horsepower of a boat that carries a family of s. It should not limit the access points that my father and his father drove to get to the river for over 100 years. It should not limit the economy that is heavily based in horse trails providing over 1/2 of the annual sales tax to operate a municipal in a rural part of the country.

We lose sight of some of the things our Constitution tried to protect, such as heritage, lineage, history, and traditions. Has the NPS studied how the GMP will affect these integral parts of our society? Have the NPS and the GMP taken any consideration as to what option will directly affect the mass of people who live, use, and work in the National Scenic Riverways?

It is these reasons that I do not support any option that the GMP has came up with as the future of the National Scenic Riverways future may hold. It is my opinion that any changes in the GMP will not be sustained by any of the local economies. It is my opinion that by allowing the National Park Service to have more regulations regarding the National Scenic Riverways, it will only cripple the struggle economy we are holding on to in rural Missouri.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please include me in future mailing concerning the General Management Plan.

Sincerely,  
Dustin W. Turner

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2907	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent:				

On behalf of Missouri Faun Bureau, the state's largest general farm organization, I submit the following comments regarding the Draft General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). Based on concerns raised by many Farm Bureau members who live and work in the vicinity of the park, we support the No Action alternative.

Although many of our members participated in the recent public meetings and have submitted written comments, our organization was not among those notified by the National Park Service (NPS) of these meetings and other opportunities to provide input during the development of the draft plan. The notification mailing list provided by NPS pursuant to our request includes the Missouri Coalition for the Environment, Sierra Club, L.A.D. Foundation, Missouri Parks Association, American Rivers and The Nature Conservancy, but no organizations of comparable stature representing landowner interests. On a regulatory proposal with potentially significant ramifications for land use policy, we believe this was a serious oversight. At this point, we strongly urge the NPS to "level the playing field" by according proportionately more weight to views expressed by local residents.

We believe the No Action alternative is the least intrusive option in terms of property rights. We oppose the proposed wilderness designation and further restrictions on the use of park property as well as any restrictions that might affect the use of surrounding private property.

As suggested by numerous commenters, we urge the NPS to improve management under the existing general management plan in two ways. First, involve local citizens in seeking solutions to management problems and ongoing planning efforts. One commenter suggested reactivating a local advisory board. Second, focus enforcement resources where needed rather than adding new regulations that impose blanket restrictions. Budget constraints are likely to keep enforcement staffing shorthanded. Enforcement action that targets ,disruptive behavior rather than

blanket restrictions that penalize more visitors makes sense not only from the standpoint of limited staffing but also fairness.

Compared to parks in more remote locations, further restricting access to this park would impact more park visitors. Reduced access would be especially adverse for those whose physical condition makes motorized access for hunting, fishing and other activities necessary. Such individuals would include a significant number of military service veterans and others locally for whom these activities are a cultural tradition and part of their lives since childhood. Furthermore, an aging population is likely to increase demand for motorized access.

The existing management plan can accommodate diverse uses of the park and at the same time provide for a positive experience for all. We urge the NPS to adopt the No Action alternative and work within its framework by targeting resources to address priorities identified with local input. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.\

Sincerely,  
Blake Hurst

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2908    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I grew up at Williamsville, MO in Wayne County and made several trips to the Big Spring in Big Spring State Park in the 1930-1950 time. I have visited the area around Van Buren and Alley Spring's in the years since then.

I support the idea that it is a National Park and not a Missouri park or a local land owner's park and should be managed to the best interest of all the people of the USA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2909    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATIONS  
FOR CURRENT & JACKS FORK RIVERS

**OVERVIEW:** After reading the article in the Sunday 1/26/14 Post Dispatch titled "At odds over future of national park" I could not resist providing my comments and recommendations. These are intended to be objective and constructive.

**COMMENTS:** Since the Ozark National Scenic Riverway is a national park it is intended to be preserved in its natural state for all future generations. The operative word is national. The river way and surrounding land is owned by the government for the use of everybody - not just local land owners. I get the impression from the article that local land owners think they own the river. This needs to be addressed by the National Park Service (NPS) in sessions with the local landowners.

Further, the NPS has the duty and responsibility to maintain this natural resource in its natural pristine condition for current and future generations while still providing reasonable access to these facilities. Not an easy charter agreed.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. NFS needs to setup a series of educational meetings with local land owners to help them understand that this resource belongs to everybody and it is in their best interest to further these goals for their own local economy and future health of the rivers.
2. No outboard motors should be allowed to prevent erosion to the banks and safety of other canoers.
3. No ATV's should be allowed in the river or on gravel bars. There should be designated areas for ATV's.
4. No horseback riding in the river or in gravel bars. Designated horseback riding trails should be setup.

5. No overnight camping on gravel bars or sandbars. Designated camping areas should be setup were open fires are safe and fire rings available. A permit system instituted.

6. All trash must be carried out or deposited in available trash containers. Fines should be imposed for littering.

7. Only designated launching areas should be provided.

8. In order to limit the number and frequency of boats on the river at anyone time, a permit system should be instituted for groups of five (5) or more canoes. This would reduce congestion at boat ramps and on the river.

9. BWI tickets should be issued to intoxicated individuals on the water. I would not recommend a no alcohol policy on the water, but intoxicated individuals and rowdy behavior should be a cited.

10. Designated stopping areas should be provided for lunch or picnic's with trash receptacles and pit toilets if possible.

James W. Thompson  
1150 Oak Knoll Manor Ct  
St. Louis. MO 63119  
314-962-9657  
Jthomps8326@att.net

I would appreciate any feedback you may have regarding the above to jthomps8326@att.net

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2910	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Sir:				

I am writing as a concerned citizen regarding the effects the Draft General Management Plan will have to the Current and Jacks Forks Rivers. Our area relies on the tourism industry, and shutting down access to the river will have devastating effects to our economy. For decades, the people of Missouri have successfully maintained and preserved the health of the rivers and the surrounding areas. Local folks are more than capable of ensuring the health of the rivers, while permitting the public to use and enjoy the land they pay to preserve. I do strongly recommend that the National Park Service take a No Action Alternative to prevent unnecessary restrictions on public lands, ownership of private lands, and preserve the rights of landowners, and at the same time, protect our local tourism industry. We do not need the cost of big government here, nor do we want to be controlled by the government in any way, we have done well without the intervention or control of the Washington D.C. and we do not need them now. We have seen that in the past years that when the government gets to be involved, all things go sour. Those in D.C. cannot balance the budget, so why put out the funds to take what is ours when they cannot take care of it anyway? I consider these comments to be "substantive" and as such would appreciate a response. In the event that you believe they are not "substantive", please provide me with a methodology for making that determination and an explanation for how that allows you to ignore this comment.

Sincerely,  
J.D. Moore

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2911	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent:				

I am writing to comment on the draft management alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. In 2013 we witnessed the United States federal government experience a government shutdown. In that shutdown the overextended federal government identified services that were not essential to the operation of the federal government. Parks, waterways and memorials were deemed nonessential. In a time of an over extended federal

government this is an excellent place to say "NO new action be taken", at minimum. Intact I would suggest that in light of the federal government's actions of depriving citizens of the use of "our citizen's parks, memorials and waterways" The federal government should no longer be entrusted with these public properties. I suggest that these properties be turned over to the care of the states in which they are found. Therefore I feel there should be no increase in federal activity or authority relevant to proposal A, B, OR C "NO new action be taken". Response to Question 1: "NO new action be taken" Response to Question 2 "NO new action be taken" Response to Question 3: "NO new action be taken" Response to Question 4: "NO new action be taken"

John Webb

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2912    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

We are deeply concerned by the Draft General Management Plan and the preferred "Alternative B" chosen by the National Park Service. We feel the NPS is attempting to unreasonably restrict public use by closing roads, river access, campgrounds, boat usage and trails and do not think the heritage of the local people or the possible economic impact on the area have been given sufficient consideration. The following highlights are a few areas that we feel have not been given proper consideration by the NPS:

**Road Closure within the ONSR:**

1. Every road within the ONSR was once a county road built and maintained with state and local funds. Those roads connected homes, farms and small communities that were built on fertile ground on or near these important rivers. Such old "home places" were home to many current residents of the area or their ancestors, and that land, even though the houses or communities no longer exist, still has strong sentimental value to the descendants of those original owners. It was customary in those early days to bury family members just outside the yard fence or on the highest point of the family farm. We are aware of many unmarked grave sites that belong to families who still make their homes in Reynolds and Shannon counties. If roads are closed, then living family members of the deceased will be unable to travel to those grave sites to pay respect and to show their children and grandchildren that valuable part of their heritage.

2. The Draft GMP Plan B does not state which roads shall be closed. If a road is closed, the same procedure should be followed as is done for current county road closings. The proposed road closure should be posted for three consecutive weeks in the local newspaper where the road exists and posted in the local post office. Any known family member should be afforded a letter informing them of the NPS's intention to close such road. Every effort should be made by the NPS to notify affected families of proposed road closures.

**River Access Closure:**

1. Every access is considered valuable to the local people. Memories are an important part of raising a family, and sharing a favorite fishing or swimming spot with younger family members may become a thing of the past if all river accesses are not kept open.

2. River accesses are natural and caused by the rise and fall of the river. Mother Nature has actually created almost every river access currently used.

3. River accesses being considered for closure should be listed in the GMP so the affected community has the option to raise questions as to the value of each specific access.

**Campgrounds:**

1. Primitive camping is a favorite pastime of the local communities. Many of the favorite spots are used primarily by locals only. Campers at these spots are afforded no services for the camping locales even though they are required to pay a fee. If you were to visit a primitive campground you might find a family deep frying the days catch for supper, kids gathering firewood for the evening fire or family members playing a friendly game of washers or horse shoes. On any given night at the Cardareva Primitive camping area you will find a group of locals - young and old - with

their instruments, pickin' favorite old tunes and singing old camp songs and river songs. This is a part of the heritage of these people, a tradition that they have the right to pass down to their children, grandchildren, nieces, nephews, etc.

2. People currently camping in primitive campgrounds must pay a fee to camp. Canoeists are allowed to camp at those same spots without having to pay a fee to camp. Most would call this discrimination.

3. The campgrounds being considered for closure would remain open for canoeists, kayakers, etc. This seems once again like the NPS is showing unreasonable favoritism for one group over another.

4. We request that the NPS identify the proposed campgrounds to be closed in the GMP.

#### Boating:

1. Boating is a favorite pastime of the locals. Rarely does a visitor show up to operate a boat on either the Current or Jack Fork rivers. For this reason the local boat owners feel unwarranted preference is being given once again to the canoeist and kayakers.

2. Boat owners do not mind, and understand, the importance of sharing the river with visitors; however, rarely do boat owners feel the affection returned. Floaters do not understand the jet boat and so educating floaters as to how a boat operates, etc., would be helpful and could curtail confrontations almost always caused by a floater not understanding a boat.

3. Closing off the northern 40 miles of the river to boat use restricts the use of the local people. If boating is allowed during the winter months for gigging, then what reasoning does the NPS have for stopping boat use during summer months?

4. Boat taxes, application fees, licensing, etc., all contribute to the state economy. Fuel, parts, accessories, supplies, etc., all contribute to the local economies.

5. Boaters have saved the lives of many floaters and boaters and on a regular basis pick up the trash left behind by floaters.

#### Enforcement of regulations:

1. The NPS needs to enforce the current regulations already in effect before increasing the regulations proposed in Alternative B.

2. As a community and an organization how can we trust that the proposed new rules/regulations would be enforced.

Since the creation of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in 1964, this area has become a premiere destination for visitors and tourists wishing to experience the "wild Ozarks" and the rivers that flow here. This designated area was created with the intent of the park being utilized as recreation for the people. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee who formed the ONSR felt so strongly that recreation be kept as a primary purpose that the committee emphasized "to make clear that recreation is a purpose" of the creation of the Ozark Scenic Riverways. The love of the river truly is the life blood of many, many local families!

To service those visitors taking advantage of the recreational opportunities afforded by open and accessible rivers, an economy has developed providing lodging, food, supplies and entertainment - including camping, canoeing, boating, hiking and horseback riding. This economy provides thousands of jobs for our local people and those people depend on this service industry to provide for their families. For this reason, we fear that our economy will be in jeopardy with the proposed changes in "Alternative B."

As an organization of nearly 65 businesses and members, we have resolved to support the "No Action" alternative. We would be willing to discuss further With the NPS our thoughts on why we support this action as well as listening to your reasoning for "Alternative B."

Many of our members will be attending the upcoming meetings and have sent in personal comments and letters.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christy Roberts  
President Ellington Chamber of Commerce

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2913    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black,

The Ozark Wilderness Waterways Club of Kansas City is a longtime supporter of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and was part of the organizational effort in the 1960's to preserve the Current and Jacks Forks rivers. Our organization represents over 170 families that have camped and canoed on these rivers for over 50 years. We support the park service's program to develop an updated management plan that recognizes the present conditions of these rivers and use patterns. The way these rivers are being used and enjoyed has greatly changed since this Scenic Riverways was established. Many of the changed usages of the river are causing damage to these rivers that may change the rivers forever and degrade their enjoyment. The Ozark Wilderness Waterways Club supports the implementation of Plan A in the proposed General Management Plan. Plan A has the best chance of reversing the harmful effects on the river by achieving the following:

â€ The most effective option for decreasing the number of access points and closing illegally developed road/trails. This must stop motorized vehicles from driving on gravel bars.

â€ Places the best limits on motorized vehicles to official roads. Implements a reasonable plan for limiting motorboat horse power to motorboats above Two Rivers.

â€ Provides better usage of river system by horses by limiting their trails, eliminating illegal trails and reducing river crossings. These changes will also reduce E. Coli contaminations and make it safer for swimming. It is also important to stop the damage and contamination to gravel bars by horses.

â€ Proposes a reasonable gravel bar usage plan that has the potential to restore the gravel bars to their natural state.

Plan A is the strongest option for reaffirming the priorities originally established in the law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve it for future generations. Above all, the NPS must act for to do nothing would further damage this river system and push the system to the point that it is beyond saving. Time is of the essence to prevent further harmful use of these rivers that will damage these rivers for generations to come.

Not only the members of our club, but thousands of individuals and families visit these rivers each year expecting rivers that are scenic and an experience that allows them to enjoy the rivers without damage from mankind.

Sincerely,  
Ron Bishop  
President, Ozark Wilderness Waterways Club

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2914    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** The people of the City of Eminence have some concerns regarding Ozark National Scenic Riverway's (ONSR) Draft General Management Plan Alternative B. We are concerned about the effect it may have upon our economy. Tourist revenues in Eminence have remained flat for about 10 years. With everincreasing costs of doing business, our local economy is suffering at this point in time. Any attempt to further limit the number of visitors will have a damaging effect upon our economy.

In a documentary filmed in the late 1970's and released for viewing circa 1980, "Shannon County: Hearts of the



Children", Windy Smith of Windy's canoe Rental in Eminence proclaims that "we can put 2,500 canoes in the river on a Saturday". In 1987, local adventurers stacked 767 rental canoes to claim the Guinness Book of World Record's largest canoe tower record. Currently, there are only 700 canoe permits in the Eminence area. During peak season weekend demand, about 500 of these canoe permits are used on the Jacks Fork River, and 200 are used on the Current River.

Any further limitation to the total number of floaters would have a negative effect upon our economy. There are two statements in the Draft General Management Plan that suggest this may happen. 1) the redesign of access points to alleviate overcrowding" issues, and 2) a suggestion of 40 canoes per mile of river. A subsection of the DGMP pertains to "overcrowding". Yet, an ONSR visitor survey from 1996 showed that 84 percent of respondents did not believe that overcrowding was an issue. Although we agree that there are a lot of people on the river approximately 25 days/year - twelve weekend Saturdays three 3-day weekend Sundays ten June and August trail-ride weekdays - there are 340 other days in the year, and we do not believe that this constitutes "overcrowding". Instead of fewer canoes, we plead for an incremental increase in canoe permits in the Eminence area. Alternative B proposes a horse permitting system which would further limit the number of visitors to the Eminence area. Instead, we would suggest a well-designed horse trail system that disperses riders away from the rivers. Missouri Department of Conservation's Lick Log trail system does just that, and additional trails will alleviate many concerns without resorting to a horse permitting system. We suggest that you coordinate with MDC to extend our Eminence-area horse trail system.

Instead of fewer horseback riders, we need more.

We are concerned about the closure of 45 miles of roadways inside the ONSR. We plead for the ONSR to honor the 1989/90 Roads and Trails Agreement, and we ask that ONSR leave open any previously NPS maintained roads. We ask that ONSR not close roads to historical family homesteads and family cemeteries. If closed, elderly residents and handicapped citizens will not be able to access them. And, it is our belief that the ONSR must maintain current roadways for emergency services and forest fire incidents.

We support motorized 60/40 boat horsepower limits along much of the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers. However, we want to see traditional motorized boat usage on the upper reaches of both rivers; We are of the belief that low summertime river flow rates are sufficient to regulate motorized boats during peak tourist season.

We insist that a visible presence of law enforcement personnel would positively impact many of the current "problems" that exist in the ONSR. It has been said that 90 percent of law enforcement is simply being seen, so we suggest Park Rangers be more visible to the public. They can offer assistance and" advice, and write tickets where warranted.

The City of Eminence completed an extensive water system upgrade in 2013, and we are pleased to announce that we are in the process of upgrading our sewer system. We will replace two sewer main trunk lines, and we will be adding a sewer line into a residential neighborhood. We have completed the sewer works preliminary engineering survey, and our system upgrade plan is in committee at MSWWWA. We anticipate start of construction in 2015. Any financial assistance from the National Park Service would be greatly appreciated.

We anxiously await the final General Management Plan, and we plead that you give consideration to our requests.

Signed,

Jim Anderson, Mayor  
Mike Atchison, Alderman & Chairman  
Ernest Middleton, Alderman  
Gary Young, Alderman  
Robert McQuerry, Alderman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2915    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent.

I prefer Alternative A for the GMP of the ONSR. I oppose the use of motorized boats & equestrian use on & in the rivers in the park. This park's problems have included the seemingly ever-expanding presence of motorized vehicles and their maze of eroded tracks in riparian areas and on gravel bars; the explosive growth of equestrian use and proliferation of undesignated trails and river crossings (many of which are in sensitive riverine areas or on steep, heavily-eroded slopes); overcrowding in certain reaches of the rivers and resulting conflicts among user groups, coupled with the rowdy behavior of some visitors; and inadequate monitoring and enforcement of scenic easements.

I believe Plan A will decrease the number of access points and close illegally developed roads/trails. It will limit the horse power of motorboats above Two Rivers. Plan A provides better usage of the rivers by horses and motorizes boats. It limits access to the rivers by motorized vehicles except on official roads. It eliminates illegal horse trails and reduces river crossings. These changes reduce E Coli contamination and make the rivers safer for swimming. Plan A proposes reasonable gravel bar usage and stops the damage and contamination by horses. This will have the potential to restore gravel bars to their natural state.

Plan A has the best chance of reversing the harmful effects on the rivers and returning them to the condition they were in when the Scenic Riverways was established.

Alfred M. Hussar, Jr.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2916	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,15,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				

**Correspondence:** Thank you for opportunity to provide public comment on the subject proposal. I grew up in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) and enjoyed countless hours of recreation there. My son Daniel is now 16 years old and is enjoying the same experiences in the ONSR as I did as a kid. We appreciate the opportunity to provide our comments and relay our personal experiences on one of America's natural treasures.

#### BACKGROUND:

Over the past 44 years I have spent many days on the ONSR enjoying the diverse opportunities it has to offer. My son has spent the last two years enjoying the same things. In addition to that many of my family members and friends spend just about every weekend on the ONSR. I am very familiar with all that the ONSR has to offer. I have personally floated the ONSR in canoe from Cedar Grove to Two Rivers. I have boated many stretches of the river in a motorboat with both a 25 horsepower jet and a 60/40 jet, I have swam, waded, and floated tubes on various portions of the river. I have giggered from a 60/40 motorboat. I have floated in a non-motorized flat-bottom boat while fishing. I have fished from the shore. I have visited many of the caves and springs in the area and walked some of the hiking trails. I have road ATV's where permitted and also camped on the gravel bars. After reading the draft management plan, the only thing I see in it that I haven't personally participated in is horseback riding. However, I do have friends who have. I would say this gives me a very broad and unique view on the opportunities available on the ONSR.

Additionally, I am a frequent user of many of our other National Parks; places like Glacier National Park, Yellowstone National Park, Voyagers National Park. I also take advantage of many similar locations that offer "limited access;" places like the Boundary Waters Canoe Area with non-motorized areas, MINGO Wildlife Refuge and Hamburg Bend Conservation Area limited to muzzleloader and archery hunting. I have a great appreciation for the need to balance the protection of our natural resources and their use.

This is the perspective that I bring with my comments that follow. Having studied the full 534 page proposal, I have selected a few specific areas that I feel need consideration as this proposal is reviewed. This is not a comprehensive discussion on the proposal. I will focus my remarks to a few very specific areas that I feel are critically important as you consider this management proposal.

#### JUSTIFICATION:

The plan states, "This new management plan for Ozark National Scenic Riverways is needed because the last comprehensive planning effort for the National Riverways was completed in 1984." I agree. It is important to consider strategic objectives every so often and this was likely overdue. However, the proposal fails to make a substantive argument for such a radical change in the management strategy. The proposal fails in four specific areas as discussed below:

- 1) The proposal says, "Patterns and types of visitor use have changed ... " Yet this is not validated by the data contained' within the report itself. The only substantive change in visitor activities noted in the proposal and based upon my personal experiences is the use of tubes to float the river vs canoes. While I agree this is a change, it is certainly not one that provides for a substantive or substantial change in overall impact to the resource itself or the other visitors to ONSR.
- 2) The proposal says, " ... technology has introduced opportunities for recreational activities and access not envisioned in the past." Yet, the proposal fails to identify and quantify these "technologies" or other "opportunities."
- 3) The closest this proposal comes to a coherent justification for such a radical change in management strategy is what it describes as "By far the most commonly expressed concerns in public scoping were related to visitor behavior." It is reported that, "A recurring complaint by commenters was the growing amount of disrespectful and vulgar visitor behavior. Most commenters stated concerns about drug and alcohol use, and trash and litter along the rivers and surrounding lands." I agree that they may be an issue. However, in my personal experience these are largely isolated events and have little impact on the overall resource and rarely impact visitors. Regardless, this is not substantial justification to radical change the use habits of the majority of the visitors. Instead, a more logical approach would be to focus efforts on controlling and enforcing the questionable behavior.
- 4) Lastly, the proposal seeks to significantly limit public access to much of the ONSR. There is no substantial argument to justify this. The fact is visitor use has remained essentially stable at approximately 1,500,000 visits per year from 1973-2008 (ref: page 200, Figure 10). That is 30 years! The National Park Service (NPS) might have a reason to address usage rates if there were trends of increased usage that were putting unsustainable pressure on the natural resources or if the experience were becoming so unsatisfying that visitors quit coming to ONSR. Neither is true. I have enjoyed the ONSR since 1980. I spent two weeks there this summer and I can say without doubt that the resource is essentially unchanged from 1980. The resource is not suffering from the current use levels. Additionally, the visitor satisfaction survey cited in the proposal itself discounts negative visitor impacts. In fact, 84.2% in the survey said there was "no need to limit amount of visitor use" and 75% said the ONSR was "not excessively crowded. We know that no matter how few users there are, some will always say there are too many. Additionally, the 2010 study cited in the proposal stated the following: "Motorized and nonmotorized watercraft users were asked if other river users were a problem for them. Among motorboaters, 13.5% thought that other users were a problem, while only 3.9% of nonmotorized watercraft users perceived other users as a problem. These numbers clearly indicate the vast majority of visitors are happy with the current usage strategy.

#### FISCAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The NPS recommends Option B. Within that recommendation is the assertion that "NPS's estimated cost to implement Option C will likely prevent its implementation." That is an excellent point. In the current budget environment we face in the Federal Government fiscal accountability is a paramount concern. So let's take a quick look at the projected cost of each proposal. According to Table 9 on page 114 (there is more data in Table 12 on page 116, however those numbers don't match Table 9 numbers and it is unclear if they are in addition to the Table 9 numbers), the additional cost for each option is listed below:

No-Action	Option A	Option B	Option C
Option			
One-time facility costs (table 9)	\$0	\$7,498,000	\$6,703,000
Annual operating costs	\$6,582,000	\$9,304,000	\$8,821,000
Increase to annual operating	\$0	\$2,722,000	\$2,239,000
		\$5,677,000	
		increase	increase

costs  
Full-time staffing 0 34 26 47  
Increase  
Total

As can be clearly seen if cost is an issue (and in this era of tight budgets better be), the option with the lowest cost is the No-Action Option. According to the charts provided in the report they claim approximately \$4,000,000 more additional cost in "deferred maintenance" for the No-Action Option, however that is not justified in the proposal. Options A-C then would cost an additional \$7-12M in one-time facility costs, \$2-6M per year additional operating costs, and 26- 47 additional full-time equivalent positions at an extremely high personnel cost. Even if you estimate the FTE's at a low cost of \$50,000/year that amounts to an additional \$1.3-2.35M in cost per year.

Based upon these numbers I would agree with the NPS that Option C's cost would "likely prevent implementation." However, I would also argue that the costs of options A and B are significantly higher than the No-Action Option and are not substantially lower than Option C. According to the proposal, ONSR is currently only able to staff 72 of its 95 authorized positions and maintains a current backlog of deferred maintenance of \$27,083,000. If they can't find the funds to hire 23 currently authorized positions and pay for \$27M in needed maintenance, where would the greatly increased funding requirements for Options A-C come from, especially in a federal government budget that is looking to cut funds wherever it can? Given that, it is illogical to pursue and adopt any management strategy as fiscally unsustainable as this one; thereby leaving the No-Action option as the only feasible option.

#### ADDITIONAL ISSUES:

While the previous two issues are very significant, I do want to address a couple other issues of concern.

1) The alternative to "limit gravel bar camping to designated gravel bars away from the river" is unjustified. The proposal asserts that "This would help minimize some riverbed disturbances, erosion, sedimentation, water quality degradation, and turbidity in many gravel bar areas." Anyone who has spent time on the river knows that the impact of a camper or tent on the gravel bar is extremely minor compared to the impact on these gravel bars with each spring flood. Every year the flood waters change these gravel bars. To suggest that my setting a tent and a small campfire or even an RV on the gravel bar has a negative impact is frankly unfounded. I've watched these gravel bars for 30 years and know it is not true. As with many of the assertions in the report, there is no evidence proving this point.

2) The proposal to limit motorboat access to only the period between Labor Day and March 15th is unjust and unfair. Our rivers are for everyone's enjoyment. There are a large percentage of ONSR users who do so in the summer months via their motorboats. According to the 2010 study cited in the proposal only 3.9% of other non-motorized users perceived other users (e.g. motorboat users) as a problem. Yes, there may be some isolated issues of conflict between motorboat users and non-motorized users but these are isolated and antidotal, not the norm. There is no sound justification within the proposal to limit motorboat usage beyond its current limits.

3) I take issue with the proposed watercraft usage numbers in Table 8, page 99. There is no justification or logic to these proposed numbers. The chart suggests 70 watercraft per mile for the upper sections (Cedar Grove to Pulltite) of the Current River and 10 watercraft per mile for the middle sections (Round Springs to Chilton Creek). This makes no sense. The river is much smaller and can support fewer watercraft in the upper sections. Additionally, much of that area has naturally extremely limited motorized boating opportunity. However the river is much larger/wider from Round Springs to Chilton Creek and can support more watercraft, including providing more opportunity for motorized watercraft. The current watercraft usage on the river is appropriate. I've been there on weekends and weekdays both. Anyone wanting an more "isolated" opportunity to enjoy the river can do so very easily on a weekday. In fact I just spent this past labor day weekend camped at Bee Bluff for 4 days. The amount of canoes and motorized boats I saw was pretty small. They in no way detracted from my experience. I was able to set in the river for over an hour without interruption by anyone on a busy stretch of the river on one of the busiest days of the year. Try doing that at Yellowstone or Glacier. I have. It is impossible. Those parks are bumper to bumper traffic all summer long. The ONSR has got it right the way things are now. They are not too crowded.

#### SUMMARY:

Based upon the analysis above I strongly urge the NPS to adopt the No-Action Option. It is clear that Options A-C

do not reflect the desires of the majority of users of the ONSR, do not provide substantive improvement or protection of the ONSR, and are not financially viable or sustainable. Options A-C unnecessarily restrict access to and use of the ONSR by the 1.5 million visitors who enjoy it every year and does so at a substantial cost. Rather than adopting the radical restrictions on use proposed in Options A-C I encourage NPS and ONSR to concentrate their efforts within the current strategy by updating it and making logical improvements focused on addressing the minor issues discussed in the proposal.

Finally, LEAVE IT ALONE! The current management strategy provides a tremendously wide range of opportunities for all to enjoy. Anyone can enjoy a quiet hike alone a trail, an ATV ride, sitting on a peaceful gravel bar, camping on a gravel bar, a quiet canoe float without motorboats, a nice motorboat ride, a nice swim, diving off a cliff, a horse trail ride, etc, etc, etc. The ONSR offers all of these opportunities for anyone willing to seek out the parts of the ONSR that currently offer what they are looking for.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide input. I hope my inputs will be carefully considered along with the many other inputs I'm sure you will receive. Our public lands are a tremendous resource to this country, Missouri, and the Ozarks. We all want to ensure they are available for enjoyment to the widest public, not "locked" away so that only a hand full of the elite are able to enjoy them.

Respectfully,  
Phillip and Daniel Callahan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2917    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,14,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** The mission of the St. Louis Canoe and Kayak Club and its one hundred plus members is to promote paddling and boating skills, foster safe and sustainable water recreation habits, and promote the wise use and stewardship of our water and watershed resources.

With that mission in mind, we reaffirm our position to pursue improvements in the operations of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. We recommend the acceptance of National Park Service preferred Alternative B in the draft General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

We believe Alternative B will:

â€ First and foremost, provide the visitor an opportunity to enjoy the natural beauty and outdoor experience of one of the most beautiful and unique river systems in the country.

â€ Provide the visitor a safe wholesome recreation environment.

â€ Support the Park Service Management to bring Ozark National Scenic Riverways up to expected National Park standards.

â€ And, at the same time, provide an economic boost to the state, the region, and the local communities.

We recognize and applaud the efforts of the National Park Service in creating the draft plan and its many considerations. It's imperative that action is taken promptly to end the abuses and degradation of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways rivers and their watersheds as they exist today.

Respectfully,  
Joyce L. Bork  
St. Louis Canoe and Kayak Club

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2918    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent.

I prefer Alternative A for the GMP of the ONSR. I oppose the use of motorized boats & equestrian use on & in the rivers in the park. This park's problems have included the seemingly ever-expanding presence of motorized vehicles and their maze of eroded tracks in riparian areas and on gravel bars; the explosive growth of equestrian use and proliferation of undesignated trails and river crossings (many of which are in sensitive riverine areas or on steep, heavily-eroded slopes); overcrowding in certain reaches of the rivers and resulting conflicts among user groups, coupled with the rowdy behavior of some visitors; and inadequate monitoring and enforcement of scenic easements.

I believe Plan A will decrease the number of access points and close illegally developed roads/trails. It will limit the horse power of motorboats above Two Rivers. Plan A provides better usage of the rivers by horses and motorizes boats. It limits access to the rivers by motorized vehicles except on official roads. It eliminates illegal horse trails and reduces river crossings. These changes reduce E Coli contamination and make the rivers safer for swimming. Plan A proposes reasonable gravel bar usage and stops the damage and contamination by horses. This will have the potential to restore gravel bars to their natural state.

Plan A has the best chance of reversing the harmful effects on the rivers and returning them to the condition they were in when the Scenic Riverways was established.

Alfred M. Hussar, Jr.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2919	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,13,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Sir,				

My name is Joe B. Whetstine, a citizen of Texas County Missouri. My address is 4021 Eagle Dr, Cabool, Mo. 65689.

My phone number is home: 417-962-4650, cell 417-254-1939.

I would like to submit 2 comments on the "Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan" for your consideration. (See attached.)

My family has lived in Texas County since the 1870's. The forests of this area essentially built St. Louis during these years.

We had the freedom to use the natural resources to our best advantage and to the advantage of our cities. The rivers were very important for transportation of logs to the mills and people to market, fishing, trapping, building material (gravel for concrete) as well as recreation.

Evidently we have not done too bad a job as our government and city citizens have been and continue to want to preserve what we have managed over the past 150 years.

Today we live with rules and regulations and permitting on our land and rivers and the timber industry that has severely affected small business (such as saw mills, charcoal plants, and the flooring industry.

Farmers are limited to how many cattle they can have in one place, also hogs, and chickens. Permits are required for any of the previously mentioned.

Why would we native people want to misuse our country? We live here and depend on it for our livelihood.

What might the reaction be if some of the citizens in this area would petition to close 65 miles of roads and many bridges (river access) commonly used by your citizens?

Therefore: I strongly recommend NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE for the proposal of a wilderness area where

essentially all activity would be prohibited.

As a retired County Commissioner of Texas County and a citizen of this area for my lifetime, I highly recommend that you or your legal people look at the Texas County Land Use Plan. I believe that the other counties involved in this proposal also have land use policies that pertain to Federal and State control of local land, traditions, customs and lifestyles.

These plans are recognized by State and Federal courts. I do object to further regulation and control of our country by foreign (city & urban) folks. Our native folks have made these hills and valleys what they are now, so why do we need all this help to do what we have already been doing? We don't come to your city and set rules and regulations on what you do in your back or front yard. Therefore I strongly recommend that the National Park Service take NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2920    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I am opposed to the park service proposed "New Management Plan" that would shut down public access points on the rivers, eliminate motorized boat traffic from certain areas, further restrict boat motor horse power in other areas, close several gravel bars, and propose additional area to be designated as federal wilderness. These are some of the same proposals presented in the "CRM" plan that the public was so adamantly against "Revisited."

Our Eighth Congressional District is home to some of the most naturally beautiful areas in the country. We are fortunate to have the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers that provide families with a place to canoe, swim, boat, and fish close to home.

The rivers also support numerous small businesses that cater to the needs of visitors who come from far and wide to enjoy the clear waters and natural scenery.

Alida Woolsey  
Albert Woolsey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2921    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I am opposed to the park services proposed "New Management Plan" that would shut down public access points on the rivers, eliminate motorized boat traffic from certain areas, further restrict boat motor horse power in other areas, close several gravel bars, and propose additional area to be designated as federal wilderness. These are some of the same proposals presented in the "CRM" plan that the public was so adamantly against "Revisited."

In 1964 the National Park Service included the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways with the goal of preserving access to numerous areas in our Congressional district. Just last week the Parks Service released a new management plan that would shut down public access points on the rivers, eliminate notarized boat traffic from certain areas, further restrict boat motor horsepower in other 'areas, close several gravel bars, and propose additional area to be designated as federal wilderness.

Albert Woolsey  
Alida Woolsey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2922    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,09,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I am opposed to the park services proposed "New Management Plan" that would shut down public access points on the rivers, eliminate motorized boat traffic from certain areas, further restrict boat motor horse power in other areas, close several gravel bars, and propose additional area to be designated as federal

wilderness. These are some of the same proposals presented in the "CRM" plan that the public was so adamantly against "Revisited."

Generations of Missourians in our congressional district have enjoyed the Jack Fork and Current Rivers. The rivers are also the engine that drives numerous small businesses. When bureaucrats in Washington try to restrict land and river usage for families and businesses, our district suffers. I hope residents across the Eighth District will join me in supporting access to our public lands and rivers and urge the National Park Service to support the No Action Alternative.

Alida Woolsey  
Albert Woolsey  
â€

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2923    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Black:

The following are comments on behalf of the st. Louis Audubon Society regarding the alternatives for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in Missouri. The st. Louis Audubon Society has over 3,000 members in the greater st. Louis area. We are a local affiliate of the National Audubon Society whose mission is to conserve and restore natural ecosystems, primarily birds and other wildlife and their habitats, for the benefit of humanity and the earth's biological diversity.

We commend the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for its decision to review its management practices. The increased pressure of horses, mechanized vehicles, easement issues and lack of funding for enforcement is threatening the water quality and overall integrity of this superbly featured region. Many of our Missouri natural areas have been studied for bird habitat and conservation recommendations. The Riverways is within the Current and Jacks Fork Watershed Important Bird Area (IBA). This is one of 47 mA's in the state, and is exceptional because it is one of the largest IBA's and overlaps with two of Missouri Department of Conservation's designated Conservation Opportunity Areas (COA). Since IBA's are important for migrating and breeding birds, the st. Louis Audubon Society and other Audubon affiliates hope to assure that conservation goals for these areas are met.

Of the general management proposals for ONSR, the st. Louis Audubon Society recommends Alternative B, opposing Alternatives A and C. Because the conflicting nature of many of the current activities are degrading the stream banks and water quality, we support stronger management and control with regard to access enforcement and habitat restoration. We agree with policies that restrict access by all-terrain vehicles, decrease horse volumes, and increase enforcement efforts at unauthorized access points. Plan B also supports resource monitoring, research and preservation projects that are critical to inform both future NPS management plans as well as provide the most accurate information to area visitors. We also support the proposal for wilderness designation of the Big Spring section.

In addition, we feel that the NPS has the deepest knowledge of its own capabilities and which management plan is most likely to be realistically and successfully implemented in the ONSR. Our support of Plan B reflects our vote of confidence in the NPS preferred plan.

The enjoyment, beauty and benefit of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will be dependent on it remaining as natural and wildlife-diverse as possible while continuing to provide well-managed recreational and educational opportunities for visitors.

Sincerely,  
Jean P. Favara

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2924    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,09,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I am opposed to the park services proposed "New Management Plan" that would shut down



public access points on the rivers, eliminate motorized boat traffic from certain areas, further restrict boat motor horse power in other areas, close several gravel bars, and propose additional area to be designated as federal wilderness. These are some of the same proposals presented in the "CRM" plan that the public was so adamantly against "Revisited."

The changes proposed by the Park Service \A,ould have a devastating impact on the economies of any communities in our Eighth District. Historically, individuals and businesses have been allowed to guide tourist through the riverways, and provide them with valuable services. These folks are the backbone of our local economy. Restricting access to park and closing public access points are extreme measures that do not make sense. Preventing the use of motors on boats in certain areas, and limiting their poser in others, will damage a local economy that is already the victim of burdensome federal regulations. The land use policies associated with Wilderness Areas are unwelcome additions to a park that is well functioning and beloved by those of us who grew up here.

Alida Woolsey  
Albery Woolsey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2925    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I appreciate being asked to give ideas to manage our lovely Scenic Park but probably can't get to the meeting. The ideas I've heard and liked is to have a few enforcement officers go undercover occasionally to monitor misconduct. It would cause second thoughts among possible wrong-doers, I'm sure.

Keep up the good work!

Respectfully,

Virgie L. Evans

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2926    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** The Ozark Wilderness Waterways Club of Kansas City is a longtime supporter of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and was part of the organizational effort in the 1960's to preserve the Current and Jacks Forks rivers. Our organization represents over 170 families that have camped and canoed on these rivers for over 50 years. We support the park service's program to develop an updated management plan that recognizes the present conditions of these rivers and use patterns. The way these rivers are being used and enjoyed has greatly changed since this Scenic Riverways was established.

Many of the changed usages of the river are causing damage to these rivers that may change the rivers forever and degrade their enjoyment. The Ozark Wilderness Waterways Club supports the implementation of Plan A in the proposed General Management Plan. Plan A has the best chance of reversing the harmful effects on the river by achieving the following:

â€ The most effective option for decreasing the number of access points and closing illegally developed road/trails. This must stop motorized vehicles from driving on gravel bars.

â€ Places the best limits on motorized vehicles to official roads. Implements a reasonable plan for limiting motorboat horse power to motorboats above Two Rivers.

â€ Provides better usage of river system by horses by limiting their trails, eliminating illegal trails and reducing river crossings. These changes will also reduce E. Coli contaminations and make it safer for swimming. It is also important to stop the damage and contamination to gravel bars by many hundreds to thousands of horses.

â€ Proposes a reasonable gravel bar usage plan that has the potential to restore the gravel bars to their natural state.

Plan A is the strongest option for reaffirming the priorities originally established in the law to guide the National Park Service to restore the river areas and conserve it for not only the members of our club, but thousands of individuals and families visit these rivers each year expecting rivers that are scenic and an experience that allows them to enjoy the rivers without damage from mankind.

Sincerely,  
Greg Hall

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2927    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** To Whom it May Concern,

In response to the general management plan proposed by the park service, I strongly support the no action alternative. To prevent taxpayers from using the land they have supported is unjust and a communistic way of dealing with the local public. We, who live in the local area use the riverways weekly, all year long. We clean up after the tourist leave. We love the area, that is why we are here. We choose to live in this area because we enjoy the river, hunting, fishing, riding atv's, year around, not just one time a year on vacation(as the tourist from the cities do). We choose to live here, having to drive over an hour to go do the things that the city folks live next door to. We aren't trying to go to their neighborhoods and put restrictions on their daily lives. We have taken care of this area because we want to preserve it, for ourselves and our grandkids, just as our ancestors took care of it for us. I saw a comment made by someone from one of the big cities, stating that the congressman isn't taking into account what the "majority" of the people want done(which is closing the park down) with the ONSR. O.K. take into account the large number of tourist that come in the summer, and that is a large number. Then take the smaller number of local folks and multiply it by 52 weeks of the year. I haven't counted the numbers, but common sense tells me that the locals use and take care of it more days of the year than the tourist do. I would venture to say that some of the people that are commenting that they want everything and everyone shut out of the park, has never set foot inside the ONSR. My husband's grandfather owned a large farm right in the middle of what is now the ONSR. He didn't want to sell, but the government paid a small fraction of what it was worth and took it. He also was a river guide, taking Leonard Hall and other tourist on the river. So boats are also in our heritage. Now his grandkids ,great, and great-great grandkids, are wanting to continue enjoying what was once their family inheritance, and there is a chance that if the general management plan is changed, family tradition will be changed forever. Our family doesn't drive hours to vacation, we drive 15 minutes to the river to meet with family and friends. We hunt, fish, boat ride, float, camp, ride 4 wheelers and UTVs. We have in our family, disabled veterans and disabled in a wheelchair. They couldn't enjoy family get togethers without the use of motorized vehicles to get to the river. It is just as much our right as taxpayers to use the riverways as it is the right to the folks that want to use it once a year, or that just doesn't want anyone to use it at all. Please consider these comments before making a decision that discriminates against "We the People of the United States".

Thank You,  
Rhonda Moss

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2928    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent,

I support Alternative A, the most aggressive approach at protecting the Current/Jacks Form Rivers. I realize this maybe a compromise for some, but I believe Alternative A offers the only approach to ensuring the long term health of the river and the wildlife it supports. I love this area and feel committed it is protected.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,  
Sandy Kaplan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2929    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I would like to submit my opinion on the proposed new NPS Management Plan. I support Alternative B, agreeing with the NPS, as a fair compromise with respect to the various interest groups concerned. I am a resident of Shannon County, living near the Eminence area. I retired here from a large Missouri city and have been enjoying floating the Ozark streams since high school.

I have tried to look at this from the viewpoint of groups like the Sierra Club, as well as, from the eyes of my friends who grew up down here and whose families have lived here for generations. I consider myself to be a strong environmentalist and I am concerned with wanton and illegal off-road A TV and 4-wheel truck driving in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR).

I also realize the pollution that has been increasing in our stream areas due to soil erosion, litter and oil/gasoline (from the afore-mentioned), as well as pollution from the large numbers of horses along and in the streams during the trail rides.

I also have friends whose livelihoods depend upon the income generated in the area from our seasonal visitors. This ranges from trail ride workers, the vendors who provide canoes, tubes and transportation to floaters, to local businesses including gas stations, those who provide camping, and restaurant and grocery store owners and their employees.

I also enjoy being able to float from Bay Creek to Eminence without worry from motor boats in the summer. I like having friends who visit not having to worry about this as well. My friends and family who visit are often beginner canoe floaters and they lack the ability to do quick maneuvering around motor boats. Despite the safety we enjoy the quiet of being on a part of the Jacks Fork where motor boats are not allowed during the summer. The tranquility of our floats are still often interrupted by trucks (and their accompanying stereos) and from ATV's travelling illegally along adjacent stream trails and parking on the gravel bars. We are hesitant to camp along these rivers overnight anymore for the worry of trucks and ATV's illegally driving up on us in the night. It's hard to even picnic along the river without these same worries.

Many of our friends who grew up here do not participate in these illegal behaviors, but unfortunately, many residents do. They have a myriad of illegal trails that only they understand and use. Despite it being against the law they either do not care or realize that they face no repercussions for their actions. These illegal roads and trails open up the wildlife and fish to illegal poaching activities as well. Gunshots near the river also present obvious safety concerns. These illegal activities more times than not also include excessive drinking and/or illegal drug use. Loud music excessive alcohol consumption, illegal drug use, raucous behavior and firearms all present reasons for me to worry about the safety and enjoyment of me and my family along these streams (especially at night). These behaviors also bring litter from beer cans to other assorted trash that we have to look at and then do our best to pick up and remove.

Unfortunately many people do not realize th.at these resources belong to all Americans and that these lands are not their private hunting, fishing, camping, and off-road parks. Closure of illegal roads and trails, and restriction of horse-riding to only authorized areas and trails would be some great starts to restoring these areas health and tranquility. Strictly enforced vehicle-free zones along these streams would allow us to follow the rules to have safe and wholesome areas for us to enjoy (including overnight camping) without the present concerns we have. Access to historic homesteads and grave yards should still be allowed, of course, to the people who grew up and live here. Permission could be given for vehicle access to these areas on an individual basis with prior permission having been received from the National Park Service (NPS). This argument of free access to these areas is often used as an excuse for illegal behavior by those who drive their trucks and A TV's, or ride their horses, wherever and whenever they wish.

I also understand the sadness and resentment that many residents feel for past actions and behaviors from some employees of the NPS. Polite and professional interactions with the public and protection and restoration of historic sites, buildings and graveyards would go a long way in mending many peoples hurt feelings with the NPS. I realize that present NPS employees and administrators weren't the ones who took land and property away through eminent

domain from some of the local residents. But unfortunately there is still a real "us against them" feeling from some locals toward the NPS. Also the abuse and selfish manipulation of those who own or control scenic easements and can afford good lawyers is a slap in the face to those who lost their land through eminent domain. The large and expensive newly built homes and resorts along these rivers are an eye sore and proof of the inequality that has been practiced on ONSR lands.

An obvious visual presence of professional-acting NPS employees, including ample numbers of members of enforcement, along our streams, access points and campgrounds would also help with curbing many illegal activities and provide positive interactions between the public and the NPS. I also feel that (if this is not presently occurring) that in the future a portion of canoe or tube rentals, and fees paid by trail ride participants, should go directly to the NPS for the management, care and restoration of the ONSR.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the upcoming decisions on how our ONSR lands will be managed. I have been a participant in public meetings concerning these issues now for many years and I hope the NPS will proceed with the strategies and action of the proposed Alternative B. I am not signing this because I was told by NPS staff at the Van Buren office that my anonymity could not be promised if legal actions to obtain all pertinent records by opponents of the proposed alternatives was pursued in the future. Thank you again for allowing me to comment on these delicate issues.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2930    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I am opposed to the Federal and State Governments taking away more of my rights. I am 70 years old, a taxpayer all my life, and have enjoyed Current River before it became "ONSR". My wife and I own a small cabin just downstream from the Van Buren Bridge.

Originally the plan was sold to local people as a scenic easement. Through the years since Patricia Nixon dedicated the park, more and more rules and regulations (with fines) have been imposed on users of the park.

I have enjoyed the old roads to long-gone homesteads, cemeteries, sawmills and CCC camps. Now many roads are closed. I am too old to hike to these historic places; therefore I rely on my ATV to get me there.

The Carter County Nature Conservancy welcomes ATV's. As their study shows, the ATV's do no damage to fire trails. They do not want horses whose hooves tear up the soil or trucks which compact the soil. "ONSR" and the MO Dept. of Conservation has an opinion quite the opposite. They cannot close roads and trails quick enough.

My boat has a 60/40 motor. However, I am opposed to banning boats with larger motors below Big Spring. I see these larger boats transporting large families to gravel bars for swimming, picnicking and fishing.

PLEASE LEAVE THE PARK AS IT IS. Just because you have the power to control something, doesn't mean you should use it.

Please include me in future mailings concerning the General Management Plan.

Respectfully,

Sam Beggs  
436 Whetstone Way  
Jackson, MO 63755  
â€

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2931    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,27,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Reynolds,

I am writing on behalf of the Missouri chapter of the Sierra Club regarding the comment period for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan revision process. The comment period is scheduled to end February 7, 2014 and we recommend that it not be further extended.

Our 8000 plus members in Missouri cherish the ONSR as an invaluable local and national resource. We began engagement in the GMP public participation process in 2006. In the intervening years various events have conspired to lengthen the process. We value the NPS' perseverance and hard work in developing meaningful alternatives aimed at protection of the riverways and enhanced recreational opportunities. NPS also included a public input component at each step.

Most recently dangerous winter weather compelled the NPS to reschedule public meetings and extend the comment period. That was a prudent and appropriate decision. We understand that some requests for even further extension have been presented to the NPS. However, barring any similar weather event, we urge the NPS to carry this process forward without delay. The ONSR has contemporary problems which are not met by the current, outdated plan. The public deserves to see the GMP process completed and the park managed under an updated plan.

Sincerely,  
Caroline Pufalt , Conservation Chair  
Sierra Club, Missouri chapter

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2932	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,30,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				

**Correspondence:** The Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and surrounding lands are important resources, both nationally and locally. I understand the inclination of managers who wish to improve management and protection of this resource. They naturally see more restrictive GMP guidance as key to their efforts. Additionally, I fear there is a culture within the NPS that encourages that viewpoint.

I would argue that just as important to the protection and management of the resource is the support of the citizens who use and enjoy the area. Their support is key to enforcement, fee collection, fire management, respectful use, etc. I have extensive first-hand experience with the impact of constant ratcheting of regulations while I was a District Ranger managing nearly half the use of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness in northern Minnesota. When public support erodes, management difficulties and costs increase and the resource ultimately suffers.

Consequently, while I support many of the more protective measures proposed, I strongly urge you to select the No Action alternative and work within the guidelines of your existing GMP. Users are familiar with its restrictions and no doubt feel it represents a series of hard-won compromises. Both the resource and its users will be best served in the long run by continuing to build support for the ONSR through implementation of the existing plan.

Sincerely,  
Bruce L. Slover

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2933	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,27,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				

**Correspondence:** I have enjoyed our natural resources, the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, since before the designation as a National Park. At no time have I considered restricting our access to our resource a positive notion. The very idea that our citizenry causes harm by our mere presence in nature is preposterous! On April 27, 2009 nature itself did more, in minutes, to alter the scenic riverways than man could possibly do today.

The slow creep of regulations created by the NPS over the years has not gone unnoticed by the majority of us who value the wise use of our natural resources. Consider this letter a protest of any changes to what the people established and have maintained since 1964, in spite of the NPS.

Sincerely,  
Bo Bohnsack

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2934    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,09,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** This is response to the Draft General Management Plan ("Plan"), October 2013

Preface:

On September 25, 2012 while loading our jonboat on trailer, a park ranger told a fellow senior citizen and me that our use of the upper portion of Current River was about to end. He suggested that we get a canoe. In order to adapt, he said that I should begin a regiment of exercise. Being 70 years of age in conjunction with the effects of rheumatoid and osteoarthritis on my hands and shoulders precludes much paddling. Because of these limitations we use a small 25 hp outboard engine with an electric starter. The ranger's motives for the admonitions were uncertain, but it appeared that he enjoyed the delivery of the news. As is often true during our visits, on that day there appeared to be no other people using the river in the Akers area.

If we are expected to canoe, it would require another vehicle for shuttling. Our grandchildren and I would be unable to float without an additional, accompanying licensed driver. Canoe usage would also add two more hours of ancillary activity for launching, loading, unloading, and swapping vehicles. Due to the cost, we do not have a second vehicle. And my deformed arthritic knees inhibit bank fishing activity. For me and similarly handicapped individuals these factors make use of jonboat nearly mandatory. The current rules make the portion above Akers available from September 15 to May for our jonboat. Although the Plan indicates otherwise, the 18 miles from Akers to Round Spring are available year-around (see footnote). All Plan proposed changes would eliminate our usage above Akers, and greatly limit our enjoyment of the remaining portion to Round Spring.

History:

Current has very fine fishing from Welch Spring to Round Spring. With little success on November 17, 2013 a friend bank fished at Akers. The following day we launched our jonboat at Akers and traveled upstream two holes. On the float back, it continued to be common to catch trout of 17". On the third day, we launched at Round Spring and went up to Sinking Creek. During the float back, my friend caught several smallmouth. Couple this experience with the closeness to mother's house in Houston and her delight of fish dinners, then you can understand how cherished these opportunities are.

Whether for the individual fishing, inclusion of a larger portion of family, or in conjunction with enjoying scenery, we are known to visit upper Current several times per month. We have been doing this for well over a half century.

Behavior:

When on the river we often pull over to sit motionless while others pass. We use these occasions to have conversations with fellow visitors about the area, fishing success, or the absolutely beautiful scenery. A common question concerns the distance to the next take-out.

If we pass a canoe or any other vessel, we do so in quiet water at a speed and distance so as to cause no disruption. Even at floating speed, we attempt to never pass in a riffle unless there is ample space. It is my understanding that law requires all motorized boats to yield to non-motorized boats. We always adhere to that principle.

Due to the actions of canoe clientele with their attendant congestion, rowdiness, noise, and disruption we stay away from the Akers area during the three months of summer. We have learned that a continuous parade of canoes and the above listed accompanying factors are not conducive to fishing nor relaxing. However the other nine months of the year offer increased opportunities for relaxation, family fun, and fishing in this area. Before it became too busy and our handicaps dictated, we logged many canoeing miles on upper Current.

Although the prevailing rules allow our year around boating of Current's 18 miles from Akers down to Round Spring, we visit only the 4 miles portion from Round Spring up to the Jerry Presley Conservation Education Center. Due to the frequency of canoes, we do not visit even that small stretch during summer weekends. In this way, we often see very few others on the water. By completely banning or simply shrinking the available dates, the Plan's three alternative options will exclude us from the area above Round Spring during the prettiest seasons and the best fishing months. You want to eliminate even that.

For security we always go upstream from put-in. Last summer while upstream, the outboard starter stopped functioning. The 15 year old and I floated back to Round Spring. If we had been downstream, the return would have required more physical strength than we possess. The Plan will virtually relegate us to launching at the former (Junction Ferry) landing below Jacks Fork.

#### User Conflict:

In 40 years of using our jonboat, we had only one "conflict". Our jonboat was resting on the south bank approximately 3 miles up from Round Spring. We were quietly fishing one of the best trout holes on planet Earth. A canoeing group appeared and a female canoeist began yelling at us. As she landed on the opposite gravel bar she shouted, "You don't belong here!" She yelled for her canoe-mates to get my boat information. After more hollering, the others in her group asked her to get back in the canoe. They appeared to be embarrassed. She said that she planned to contact a park ranger about us being on the river, in order to assure our arrest. At first my fishing partner and I thought that she was kidding. As she continued, it became apparent that she was serious. After they left, we continued to fish and enjoy the scenery. Except for that episode, we have never been involved in such a situation. She obviously believed that she was one of a select group.

That scene occurred during a sunny Wednesday in June 2011 when we caught (2) large rainbows, (4) nice-sized shadow bass (aka goggleye), a smallmouth bass, and (2) chain pickerel. This was not an atypical day.

This event is certainly no reason to outlaw anyone off the river. The canoeist's obnoxious behavior did no real harm.

#### Conclusions:

Since we all would not be allowed to benefit, then we all will miss the fishing, boating, and general fun of being in the area. It would be neither fair nor right for only some to continue the experience. It would be selfish.

Among those involved in the Current experience have been our grandchildren of ages 15, 10, and 8. The newest attendee is our 6 years old, water-loving granddaughter. It appears that she will have upper Current only as a fading memory. If the proposed changes become true, all the grandchildren will be robbed of further memories. My mother will miss her fresh fish dinners. I will miss being able to catch them for her. Other handicapped and senior citizens will also be so treated and denied access. In this case the creation of an exclusionary, select group of floaters is neither noble nor just.

A half-century ago with the help of family friend U. S. Representative Richard Ichord in saving it from destruction by dams and other such projects, we assumed that Current River's availability was assured. In spite of that we are now close to losing the pleasures of the prettiest portion of the arguably most uniquely beautiful stream on Earth.

This is more than an inconvenience. The result of banning our usage will be to limit the experience to a privileged class. Our favorite place on Earth, upper Current River, is about to be taken from us.

Having found ways to overcome our handicaps and limitations, this is especially disheartening.

This morning I discovered an "errata" on the same web page. Having never seen that esoteric word, it meant nothing to me. It listed the errors contained in the Plan which were referenced in my footnote.

My spouse was a legal and medical administrative assistance for four decades. She has also never seen that word before today. You may disregard my "footnote".

This applies no change to the rest of the response.

Larry McKinney  
lmckinney@cox.net

#### Footnote:

On December 31, 2013 the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan ... was downloaded from the following address.

<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID==158&projectID=15793&documentID==56208>.

On page 61 is a map displaying the "No Action" option which proposes to use existing rules. It describes a 25 hp zone with 10 hp seasonable usage as currently being in effect down to Round Spring. The actual lower boundary is 18 miles upstream at Akers. These 18 miles have no seasonal restrictions. In this zone we are able to use our 25 hp engine all year. I saw no online notation which might either acknowledge reality or correct the error.

The existence of this false and misleading information is disturbing.  
cc: Area newspapers

Larry McKinney  
627 Cleveland Road  
65483

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2935	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,30,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				

**Correspondence:** To start out with, in 1983 I floated both the Current and Jack's Fork River. To say the least I was overwhelmed by the beauty and the primeval natural of the ecosystem. Even at that time (20 years ago), I was appalled at the large number of canoes and the party like atmosphere on the river (beer cans in the river along with trash on the bars and in the river). Also canoers not showing respect for other canoers on the river. That was 30 years ago - I can only speculate what it's like 30 years later. Another concern I have is that I've heard the ecosystem is overrun with uncaring ATV user and cattle and horse manure washing into the river. The river is not only for the benefit and the profit of the local community and residents. The rivers and the ecosystem belong to all of use and should be managed for the long-term integrity and benefits of all (including wildlife).

I was also saddened and angered when I heard the Jack's Fork has been dredged for gravel on its banks and bars (causing erosion). It sounds like the locals have driven a political and economic wedge in how the ecosystem is managed. It sounds like the economic and financial factors are weighted heavily in the management of the rivers and ecosystem. Long-term planning is a must. This jewel in the Ozarks must not be compromised or plundered.

Thank you for seriously listening and taking my thoughts and ideas in consideration. In the future, may I hear good news and positive things about the future of Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rick J. Myers

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2936	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,09,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				

**Correspondence:** I am writing in response to the National Park Service, Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan.

I do not support the NPS preferred alternative, Alternative B. I feel this restricts locals/year round residents use and ability to access and enjoy the river ways as families have for generations.

Some examples of the unnecessary restrictions include:

- National Park Service wants to restrict an activity primarily partaken by the local resident. They are doing this by restricting motorized use of 34% river year round and an additional 14% during the summer time. That is 48% of the river basically closed to the locals during the peak season. Yet they didn't restrict nonmotorized visitor (tourist) at all, in fact all areas of the river are open year round.
- They want to close "about" 10 miles of roads primarily used by locals and turn them into "hiking trails". I pity the



handicapped or the aged local population.

- It closes an untold amount of access to the river. I am sure those accesses are primarily used by local residents.
- They also want to close "approximately" 65 miles of horse trails. The local equestrian population and the economy will suffer as a result of this.
- It eliminates traditional camping. It requires that campers only camp in designated areas. So you wouldn't be able to just pick a gravel bar and set up a tent for the night. Also, all designated campsites have a fee.

I feel the no action alternative is the best course of action.

- It treats all visitors: local, floater, hiker, and equestrian alike. It gives them equal access
- It doesn't restrict motor boats to nearly 50% of the river during peak times, while it gives floaters 100% access anytime.
- It doesn't turn traditional local roads to "hiking trails", yet hikers could still hike if they chose to.
- It also doesn't eliminate traditional camping, where you can float, boat, hike, or ride until you find a place to camp for the night.

I feel that the National Park Service has unrealistic ideas that they can create a silent area of the river where there are no unnatural sounds. They must think that visitors aren't going to talk, cough, breath, launch or exit their craft, touch the water with anything, or even move. They, also, must not take into account the highways and county roads in the area and the vehicle sounds that emit from normal travel. I feel that the National Park Service and any visitor, which thinks they can have a completely silent visit, are completely out of their minds.

Thank you,

Justin D. Tyler  
HC 62 Box 328  
Salem, MO 65560

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2937	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Re: Comments Draft General Management Plan ONSR				

Attention: Superintendent Black

Over its 78- year history the Conservation Federation of Missouri (CFM) has been a consistent voice for conservation, preservation and outdoor recreation in Missouri. Twenty-five years ago CFM was one of the three partners along with the Missouri Department of Conservation and Department of Natural Resources in establishing the Missouri Stream Team Program to help restore and protect Missouri Rivers and Streams. We understand the value of these great water resources and what they mean to the people of Missouri and to the economy, health and quality of life for our state.

The Current River and its tributary the Jacks Fork (which make up 134 miles of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways) are a threatened national treasure which deserves our highest level of support as a unit of our National Parks System.

We also clearly understand the need to plan for the future protection of the OSNR fish, forest, wildlife and unique cultural and natural resources in a manner that insures long term sustainability of the park. Such planning that can hopefully result in best management practices for the resource, a safe and rewarding visitor experience and sensitivity to legitimate local, regional, statewide and national interest.

As The National Park Service (NPS) is presently seeking public comment on preliminary alternatives for a new general management plan and wilderness designation for 3430 acres in the park. We encourage your support for the implementation of a new plan to help ensure quality park management services in the future.

This letter is to advise you that The Conservation Federation of Missouri is in support of "NPS Alternative B", a balanced plan that would address many of the lingering abuses and issues associated with the degradation of the

park resources and a diminished visitor experience. We also support the need for adequate staffing, the enforcement of necessary park rules/regulations and the monitoring of existing conservation easements. In addition, CFM favors the designation of a 3340- acre tract near Big Spring as wilderness.

If properly designed and implemented this new plan will hopefully be a start towards reversing nearly two decades of benign neglect in the OSNR that has lead to less than a positive visitor experience and negative impacts on the park and river. We encourage your support for helping to shape a plan that will bring resolution to the numerous perils faced by the park and allow NPS to capitalize on future opportunities for the Ozark National Scenic Riverway.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this important natural resource matter. If we can be of further assistance, please feel free to contact us at anytime by e-mail at [mhaymaker@confedmo.org](mailto:mhaymaker@confedmo.org) or call 573-634-2322.

Sincerely,  
Richard Ash, President  
Conservation Federation of Missouri

Cc: The Missouri Congressional Delegation  
The Honorable Missouri Governor Jay Nixon  
Director, Missouri Department of Conservation  
Director, Missouri Department of Natural Resources

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2938	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				

**Correspondence:** I reviewed the GMP and found the document to be very detailed; having covered about every conceivable aspect of the complex issues that the park now faces as it did throughout tenure there from 1997 until the first of 2006.

My observations and comments are 36 years of what I experienced and learned from a variety of parks I was assigned to, including the last eight at Ozark NSR.

#### The Plan

The preferred alternatives (B) to about every section seemed to be somewhat the same as the old general management plan that I had to work with, which I felt was a pretty good document except its age and somewhat lacking addressing all of the newer complexities managers of today have to face and fine solutions to.

However, I would like to address some of the sections of the plan of which I found to be either fundamentally lacking in information, legal history or addressing current issues:

Scenic Easement section must state in more detail some of the management challenges and shortfalls in handling changes and requests that often come to the managers attention without a formal procedure and process that meets all NPS regulations and reviews. I can only imagine the comments that come from your environmental friends that have involved themselves this planning process and how I mismanaged certain scenic easement tract issues. However, my actions were not taken without consultation with the regional lands office, or their advice. Anything that would strengthen this part of the plan would be better for all future managers.

60/40 horsepower issue: I had eight years of boating regulation experience Glen Canyon NRA on Lake Powell in both Utah and Arizona parts of the lake. I then got somewhat involved in the interpretation of the regulations I found at OSNR. I found that the regulations were designed for the time around the mid-1980s. They were written around the available level of outboard motors that were for sale at the time these regulations were written. The 1980's regulations were, ok, however nobody considered the change in technology and basically the size of aluminum jon boats being built to be used on the rivers in the park in the next twenty plus years. As the boats became wider, allowing for heavier load capacity, the heavier and bigger engines were installed on the boats to push them up and over the shallow shoals. To add to the conflict of understanding, newer motors have their power described as kilowatts not horsepower.

My concern is that all of the boating power limits and use sections on the rivers were designed mainly for enforcement personnel to follow and if necessary be able to articulate these regulations in court before a U.S. Magistrate. Under the current rules and regulations the Ranger must be able to identify a motor's horsepower from registration document, title, and or manufacturer's manual. If challenged in court, I suspect that the Ranger would have a hard time identifying where the engine's horsepower is located at the head or at the jet prop. If asked to convert horsepower to kilowatts and how do you measure that.

I argue that the park should have historically made boating limits and restriction limited to size and speed, as it is on most waterways. This would allow all future enforcement personnel the basic tools to restrict use of boats on certain sections of the rivers. No one realized that the size of the boats would change from old wooden 22 foot by 24 inch jonboats with 10 hp motors from the 1960's to boats now found with 200 hp outboard motors on 18 foot long and 56 inch wide boat that can be used below the Big Spring launch ramp. My main points are, that if you restrict the size and speed of any boat, you will automatically limit the size of the outboard engine. No person would invest in a \$8,000 dollar engine to be placed on a boat restricted in size to operated on a section of river that had a limit on speed along sections of the river.

Wilderness designation: As Chief Ranger of Death Valley NP for eight years I was present when the California Desert Protection Act was passed in 1994, which converted proposed lands of the Death Valley National Monument, adding 1.5 million acres to the park and making all of the National Park lands outside of developed areas wilderness.

This was a big challenge for us as managers and enforcers of new regulations over the new 3.2 million acre park. As you indicate in the plan the Big Spring area of the park is best suited for wilderness lands. I believe that all of those proposing wilderness, should investigate further if you can (cherry stem) roads and historical structures out of the proposed lands. That made it much easier for us to follow the intent of the wilderness act in DVNP. The management and strict administrative uses of these lands will change. While at ONSR and having also worked as a high school summer student in the original Big Springs State Park, nothing has changed since the State Park days. Everything is pretty much the same without any human threats from mechanical use; therefore, if nothing happens to make the land wilderness, the land use really remains the same. You can still remove the firearms range and make it all more in line with the wilderness intent.

Remember, Grand Canyon National Park has no wilderness designation based on its natural characteristic of being isolated and limited vehicle traffic to a small area. The same can be said for the lands proposed in and around the Big Spring area.

Issues Not Addressed in Plan: I would have greatly liked to have seen a specifically proposed section identifying the need for a stand-alone visitor center. The visitor center would or could be multi agency addressing all of the regional diverse related land management themes.

Beginning in 1997, I was made to contact person of the park to work with developers, and General Services Administration in beginning and finishing the Park Headquarters building where you now reside.

My ideas at the time was that it was too bad that the structure could not be located on the new four lane highway 60 that brought more traffic to the area. The GSA agreements and politics were already agreed upon before my arrival, so the best of a not great situation was made. GSA stated that they don't build Visitor Centers, just buildings for administrative use, therefore, you have what was handed to the park, not necessarily what we all wanted.

I would, for planning purposes, still include in the plan a section identifying the need for a high profile visitor center that would surpass that MDC center near Winona. I believe that the visitor center could serve as a model for educating, informing and serving the many visitors that pass through and around the park. After the new highway was completed studies indicated that the traffic increased by several thousand a month. We missed the opportunity to increase visitor contact and become more visible to the general population in the southeast part of Missouri.

Judicial System for the park: As someone who spent most of there first twenty five years of service as a visitor protection ranger throughout nine different parks and various jurisdictions I found the U.S. Magistrate and Eastern District Court of Missouri to be the worst I have observed in all of my years of service. The U.S. Magistrate in Cape

Girardeau was refusing to handle misdemeanor cases. He indicated that he was too important to handle "petty misdemeanor cases". Noel Poe and I began the process of finding a solution to our cases not being properly handled, we finally met with the District Judge in St. Louis only to find that pretty much all of those involved close ranks to protect their own.

However, the issue finally began to clear to our satisfaction, but the main reason I bring this up is that everything relative to changing regulations on boating, closing roads restricting activities anywhere within the boundaries will only be effective if and when the federal judicial system is in place and supportive of the park administration and understanding of the mission of preservation and protection.

Lots of wording in the plan indicate that education of the visiting public is the factor to reduce behavior problems and help correct activities that directly conflict with park policy or administration. I am here to advise you that having a supportive court system is paramount in correcting visitor behavior problems as complex as they are during peak visitor season. The arrest or citation will only work as long as the Judge adjudicates the cases and supports the intent of the regulation and the ranger's actions in the case.

Politics: Remember, it may not seem to be this way but there are more quiet supporters of the park than you may hear on a day-to-day basis. Everyone I knew growing up and rejoined after moving back after 30 years away, realize that the alternative to not having the park there would be much worse, but they would not let you know that. I hear of threats to turn the old state parks back to the state, and what Jason Smith is spouting off in Congress; don't let that get to you, that's been going on since the beginning. Ignorance is bliss, my mother always said, so the louder they are; the less they contribute to the well being of the park.

Finally, thanks for letting me comment and do not hesitate to contact me if you see fit for any historical, political, or general information that the current locals and or staff cannot provide.

Sincerely,

Chris Ward  
2257 E. Clairborne St.  
Springfield, MO 65804

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2939	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent:				

I'm writing to share my comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan (GMP).

I prefer Alternative B as outlined in the Draft General Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement.

Specifically, my experience in the Riverways in the following recreational uses:  
Swimming in Current River and Jack's Fork River, Hiking in to Blue Spring on Current River, Kayaking Current River near Van Buren.

These uses are important to me because:

I support preserving the clarity of our Springs and Rivers. Physical Health and my support of keeping rivers safe and clean for human recreation and wildlife. Missouri is unique in having clean rivers.

In addition, I appreciate the conservation and preservation functions of the National Park because:

Outfitters have dangerous drivers of old school buses which drive recklessly. My family has a century-long support of preservation and conservation of these rivers and springs to the fifth generation!

The primary areas I use are:

Jack's Fork River at Alley Spring Big Spring, River above and below. Big spring from Owl's Bend South.

Wehmeyer is especially overused by outfitters.

The No Action Alternative is unacceptable to me because it fails to address the need for more enforcement of existing laws and standards, to better manage overcrowding, and to improve communication and partnership with local landowners and communities. Further it fails to address these critical problems in the Riverways:

- Overcrowding of Current River by the Landing which is a monopoly in Van Buren area, making area unsafe for children, families, elderly, outfitter abuse of river.
- Pollution of rivers by meth users
- Aggressive and violent behavior by floaters involving drugs and excessive alcohol intake threatening children's safety.
- Aggressive use of large motor boats which belong on lakes

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways ("Riverways"), established on August 17, 1964, encompasses 134 miles of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. The Riverways' enabling act has three stated purposes: preservation, conservation, and recreation. As Missouri's largest National Park, it showcases several world-class freshwater springs, caves, and bluffs that are home to fish, birds, rare and endangered native amphibians, crawfish, and plants. It is a testament to Missouri's commitment to conservation that the Riverways is a National Park and was the nation's first National River.

The Current River and Jacks Fork are prime recreational waters in a stunning natural karst area that attracts approximately 1.5 million visitors each year. A 2011 study estimated visitor spending at more than \$55 million with nearly 90 percent of spending from non-local visitors. As a unit of the National Park System, management of the Riverways must ensure protection of the Park's resources in an unimpaired condition for public recreation, education, and scientific value. Among its tasks is sustaining and restoring bio-diversity for the next generation.

The management of ONSR in terms of resource preservation, sustainable use management, and restoration of natural ecosystems should rival that of our nation's most pristine and unique public lands.

A. Edgar

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2940    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Anything less than Plan A is unacceptable. I first canoed the Current River over fifty years ago. Many heavier uses of the river are taking place today. Following the 1927 flood on the Mississippi, conservationists fought off dams on the Current. We wouldn't have a river today if it weren't for conservationists.

Today conservationists continue to fight for the qualities the river was set aside for. Plans B, C, etc., if continued for a hundred years will destroy the Current River. Anything less than Plan A will hand the river over to anarchists.

Sincerely,  
Duane B. Kelly

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2941    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** On the whole, I support Alternative B, but I have some comments on various aspects of this plan. My comments are specific to the Current River above Two Rivers and the Jacks Fork River. I am not familiar with the lower Current River.

Motor Boats:

1. I am in favor of limiting motors on the upper sections of the Current (above Akers) and the Jacks Fork above Alley Spring. It is nice to have a section of each river that is quiet and you don't have to worry about dodging a boat tearing up the river around the next bend which you can hear coming.
2. Jet boats have no place on these two rivers, too noisy and too fast. They belong on bigger bodies of water.
3. 25 HP is enough.

## Horses

1. To begin, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is not primarily a horse park, so accommodating trail riders should be secondary in terms of money spent and labor expended to the cultural and natural experiences of park visitors.
2. Overnight horse camping areas should be located outside the park, operated by private business. Overnight horse camping areas would require clearing, vehicle access, outhouses, water, signage and trash collection. On going maintenance would include removing manure, roads, trash removal, vegetation control and supervision. This all cost money, better spent elsewhere.
3. Horse Trails-put the horse trails where the park wants them. Close the trails that the park does not want. Add more trails away from the river, especially on the ridges where it is more fun and prettier to ride anyway.
4. Every National Park I have been in that has trails, state that visitors stay on the trails. This park is no different. If the trail riders do not stay on the trails and cross the river at unauthorized crossings, only allow rides with a licensed guide or groups that have checked in to a post and have been given permission to ride in the park.
5. I think there should be a fee for riding horses in the park, just as there is for taking a boat on a federal lake. This money would help maintain and build new trails.

## Hiking & Bike Trails

1. Definitely more hiking trails. Wonderful way to enjoy the area. Wholly different experience than a river experience. Hiking, added to floating, would persuade people to spend more time in the area. Especially when added to more interpretive activities.
2. The lengths should be day hikes, half day hikes, overnight hikes and several day hikes. There could also be designated backpacking camping areas.
3. There are all kinds of groups that would love to build new trails and put up signage. This would save money.

## Parks Roads

1. This subject is a tough cookie, a balance between what the ONSR users want to experience on the rivers and what the locals believe they are entitled to. The one thing I might suggest is that there needs to be a lot more communication and cooperative decision making between the ONSR administration and local entities. These arrangements should be established in writing and stuck with. It should be part of standard operating procedure.
2. Securely close and restore roads and vehicle crossing not needed.
3. Designate which gravel bars vehicles can drive to, restrict the type of damage those vehicles can do to the gravel bars, and what kind of camping and noise that can happen on these designated bars.
4. Keep vehicles out of the rivers. Make violations hurt financially.
5. Vehicles cross at designated fords.
6. Signage is really important here, saying what is open and what is closed.

## Camping

1. Primitive campgrounds- I think there should be more of these spread throughout the park. The smaller, less impact camping experience is something a certain group of campers really treasure. These campgrounds might be an area that you could work with locals to use for their family reunions, deer camp, etc., only with prior notification.

## Interpretation

1. This one area where working with other groups would be beneficial. Missouri has a logging interpretive center at Twin Pines, and has a potential education and conference center at Current River State Park.
2. ONSR has at Alley Spring an incipient cultural interpretation center. Round Springs is compatible with a natural interpretation center with the cave and springs. If ONSR concentrates on the "cultural" at Alley and the "natural" at Round springs, first there is no duplication of resources and two, the ONSR experience is expanded, perhaps persuading people to spend more time in the area.
3. Preserving and restoring historical structures could be an area of potential partnerships with local church groups, state historical societies, local and state educational institutions, and special interest groups like scouts.

## Funds

1. Trail riders should pay something for park use.
2. People who put in canoes, but don't have concessionaire's permits should pay something.
3. How about season passes, nominal, for locals who put boats on the river.
4. Nominal seasonal camping passes in primitive areas for locals.

I have one more comment which probably has to do with funding, but is really a comment on the management of the park. The staff and administration associated with ONSR must be committed to implementing this new plan. They will need to put in place measures and personnel to carry out and enforce whatever is decided. Otherwise, the present situation of haphazard management or no management will continue.

The park itself is wonderful, truly a great place to spend time by oneself, with family and friends, especially grand kids. My husband and I fish, float, hike, bird and just sit in the Park. I grew up in St. Louis and have spent years enjoying this area through float trips, vacationing, camping, and now as a resident.

I also respect the local families attachment for this place, considering how recently these families lost their land. This land is still very much a part of their traditions and family experiences, which are still now being handed down to children and grand children. The natives who live away return for holidays, birthdays, reunions, graduations, deer season, gigging, turkey hunting, funeral and to retire back home. Their attachment to this area and its cultural traditions, i.e. music, hounds. Turkey calls is unique in this age of no one having roots. The rivers are central to these traditions and activities. I think locals should be given special access within decided upon limitations. They are the ones who have folks buried in family cemeteries, have memories of cabins where they lived with parents, grand parents, great grand parents, brothers and sisters and stories of all kinds of "remember whens" they shared with friends in these hills.

It is a very special place.

Yours truly,  
Carla Bascom

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2942	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter
-----------------------------	--------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am writing to comment on the ONSR GMP. I have spent time in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways my entire life and am the third generation in my family to do so.
------------------------	---

I prefer Alternative A as outlines in the GMP because of the protections it affords to our citizens and natural resources.

As a boat owner I have noticed the perils that swimmers, tuber, and canoeists are subjected to by careless and aggressive boaters. Alcohol and drug use is rampant and contributes to the rowdy atmosphere and lack of safety on the river.

I also own kayaks, canoes, and tubes and am hesitant to allow my son to play I the Current River most weekends because of the over-crowding, reckless jet-skis and drunk debauchery.

I urge you to protect our natural resources, families, and way of life and promote a safe environment. Outfitters should be required to comply with safety provisions rather than be given free range over the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. If not for conservation efforts and wise management - the treasures we value today would have destroyed long ago.

The "no action" alternative is unacceptable. It fails to address the need to address law enforcement's current challenge of enforcing the existing standards and laws. It also fails to address the issues of overcrowding, pollution, littering, drug and alcohol use, outfitter profit above everything else, and jet ski and boat use that is inappropriate for the rivers.

The establishment of the Ozark Scenic National Riverways 50 years ago was done to preserve converse and promote recreation. I encourage you to be the best steward you can be and move forward with the original commitment to these three principles.

As a southern Missouri Native and devoted Ozark fan, I hope that you will do all you can to do to protect one of our most valuable and loved natural resources.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Edgar

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2943    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I am a long-time resident of the Missouri Ozarks and have visited the Riverways and floated its rivers many times.

My comments on your draft General Management Plan/Wilderness Study/EIS are provided below. I tried to provide them via your internet website but found that I could not print a copy for myself of my completed comments. It would only print the first part of my comments that fit within the small space of page one. I learned about the document via newspaper, which is the avenue I prefer.

Comments:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways, sitting as it does in the center of the Ozarks in the center of the Nation, might well become the centerpiece of the National Park System in the future. Certainly, it fulfills National Park System mandates admirably by virtue of its unparalleled diversity of plants, animals, natural habitats, scenery, and public uses. Yet, review of this document leads me to believe-despite the extensive public involvement that the Riverways is still being drastically undersold. Perhaps too much "group think" has occurred among public and private interests alike. Perhaps the National Park Service lacks a master vision for all of its parks- -especially this one.

For example, 65,000 acres are authorized, yet only 51,654 have been acquired. Why is there not at least some mention of additional land acquisition. It would enhance public benefits and help solve specific resource/public use conflicts. Overall, the park is much too narrow, making it extremely difficult if not impossible for management to protect resources adequately. Again, thinking long range, a distance of, say, 2 miles back from the rivers on each side would make for greatly enhanced resource protection, public use, and management capability.

As another example, why is there not consideration of a major training academy, with housing, dining, and recreational facilities located in the Riverways? Certainly, management challenges here rival those of any park in the System. Therefore, it would be an ideal place for internships and practical experience following formal training for Park Service employees. Additionally, facilities could be provided for research and for preservation of biological, cultural, and historic resources. Workshops, seminars, and field trips for local citizens and others could educate, influence perceptions, and reduce conflicts among competing uses. Drunken, rowdy behavior by visitors must have no place within the Riverways. It is inconsistent with the serenity and beauty that soothes our souls. We don't allow it in art museums and we shouldn't allow it here either. For the same reason, off-road motorbikes should not be permitted, and the big, loud jet boats should be eliminated as well. If the Park Service does not demonstrate respect for natural resources-including freedom from noisy intrusions, who will? I support whatever means are necessary to ensure quiet and respectful public uses consistent with the purposes for which the Riverways was established. Zoning, increased enforcement, limiting the number of people who can have access, and requirements for permits are all legitimate management methods as needed to protect resources and provide superb visitor experiences and safety.

Human populations around the globe and in our Nation will continue to grow, causing increased potential for environmental degradation. It falls to agencies like the National Park Service to protect our natural resources from ourselves. Those of us alive today and using the Riverways are but a tiny number compared to the generations who'll use it for eons into the future. Therefore, we must err on the side of resource protection, if we err at all. For these reasons, I prefer Alternative A. It includes a wilderness designation-which I support. It has the best chance of preserving and enhancing environmental values while we wait for a master vision of a complete and fully functioning Riverways to appear for guiding the direction of management.

Sincerely yours,



R. Wayne Weier

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2944    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Good Day Mr. Black,

I hope you read all this letter and begin to be led by the spirit of God to make your decisions in time to come because this earth belongs to the one who created it, he supposed to be the one to make decisions about it as man read's his word. Read Psalms 104:5 who laid the foundations of the earth that is should not be removed forever, Ecclesiastes, chapter 1 verse 4 say: one generation passeth away and another generation cometh "But the Earth abideth Forever" No Global Warming to destroy it, back to Psalms 104:11. He sendeth the springs into the valleys which run among the hills, they give drink to every best cattle of the field, the wild asses quench their thirst if we fail to make our decisions according to what Go's word says this is what his word say's and I did not write it. Psalms 34:15. The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous and his ears are open unto their cry. 34:16 says the face of the Lord is against them that do evil, to cut off the remembrance of them from the earth, and I am not writing these things to threaten or condemn you. I am writing them to help you and our land. I don't think man should clutter it up with trash beer bottles glass and but there needs to be middle ground. What's wrong with taking pictures God don't care he gave man the technology to make cameras, he didn't intend for someone to charge for it. We have plot maps I didn't charge for man to take of picture of my farm's.

Who Jesus was baptized in the River of Jordan Matthew 3:13 people are still living baptized today in Jordan River God created the Rivers for man to be baptized in, he told all believers to be baptized Jesus or John either one did not have to pay to use the rover, god anoints his people today with his pity, he says do not touch mine anointed, and do my prophets no hard, and he said if you offend one of my little ones it would be better for you if you had a millstone tied around your neck and cast you into the sea, and again sin. I'm not trying to condemn you but not me but God is going to judge America for wrong doing I don't know if you believe in Prophets but I have heard there have been at least 2 prophets God told them that New York would be hit by a bomb, one said it would be in OBAMAS time in office, I believe that government of man is trying to take over our freedom, not making Godly decisions, but if it not of God it will be destroyed. Read Isiah 9:6 God will have last say. The Righteous shall inherit the earth they shall never by removed.

Thank you for reading my letter,

Gary Honeycult

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2945    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Please choose Plan A as the best option for the CUrrent and Jacks Fork Rivers. The reason for establishing the national scenic rivers was to preserve the unique qualities of these rivers. This purpose is being impaired as now managed.

I belong to a group who hike and canoe Ozark stream. I am 82 years old and can't participate much, but I want to see these rivers preserved for future generations. Once destroyed, we can't get them back.

Compromise is not possible and doing nothing will allow continued impairment.

Plan A is the best choice.

Sincerely,  
Cosette Kelly

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2946    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Black,

Thanks for this opportunity to comment on the proposed ONSR General Management Plan. At age 73, I'm the former editor and co-owner of the Daily American Republic in Poplar Bluff. I've spent the past 60 years enjoying the Current River from its confluence with the Black River eight miles upstream from Pochontas, Ark., to Montauk State Park.

As a newspaper reporter/photographer and outdoor columnist I covered the development of the Riverways from the initial proposal to the passage of the enabling legislation to the dedication ceremony on June 10, 1972. Dignitaries present that beautiful day included Tricia Nixon Cox, the President's daughter; National Park Service Director George Hartzog; Assistant Secretary of the Interior Nathaniel Reed; Congressman Richard Ichord and U.S. District Judge H. Kenneth Wangelin, a native of Grandin and strong supporter of the park.

Personally, I, too, have always been a strong supporter of the Riverways. Without the protection of the park, I'm convinced we now would see extreme over-development of the rivers, with the accompanying problems of blight and environmental degradation.

In 1982 Secretary of the Interior William Mott appointed me as chairman of the ONSR Advisory Commission. On May 20 that year I presided over the final meeting of the Commission, which by law was dissolved on June 10, 1982, 10 years after the park dedication.

Now, fast-forward to 2014. It's my opinion that the general public will be served best if the Park Service adopts a "no changes" course of action for the new management plan. If horses are a problem on the upper river, for example, correct the individual cases where needed. If vehicles are intruding on a gravel bar and won't respect warning signs, close it off. But don't issue a blanket regulation shutting dozens of traditional roads. That makes for terrible public relations.

Also, there is absolutely no need to ban outboard motors on the upper Current just because "the public has asked for it," the reason given to me by one of your personnel at the Van Buren public meeting. Outboard motors have been a traditional use on the rivers for 100 years. (Ole Evinrude invented the first one in 1907.) Just let Mother Nature (the depth of the shoal) govern outboard use. The current 40-horse limit (at the lower unit) is a reasonable accommodation. Another major consideration, in my opinion, is the safety issue. Those of us who have operated outboards on the Riverways for many years (I run an environmentally clean Yamaha 40/30 four-stroke) can cite you numerous instances of having rescued tubers, canoe paddlers, etc., from dangerous situations because so many of those people are grossly ignorant of the river's hazards. These are the very people, I suspect, who are pushing for an outboard ban. You don't hear boat operators demanding a tube, canoe or raft ban when traversing the river in a john boat becomes impossible on a summer weekend.

I, too, enjoy the solitude of taking my grandchildren on an overnight canoe-camping float. But I do it on weekdays and in the late fall when the river traffic has subsided.

The occasional john boat we encounter is simply part of the natural landscape for us.  
The river should be managed for EVERYONE.

Finally, I am opposed to the proposal to convert a portion of the former Big Spring Park area to a federally designated wilderness. I know that your agency mandates you do a study to determine if you have an area that might qualify. Just continue to manage Chubb Hollow as a natural area. A statutory federal wilderness area would preclude heavy equipment being used to fight fire. Also, it likely has a "slim-to-none" chance of ever being approved anyway. All the proposal has done is create a huge wave of animosity toward lithe feds." You don't need that.

Finally, I want to thank the Park Service for its 40-plus years of stewardship of our natural treasures, the Current and Jacks Fork rivers, and the riverine corridors they support.

Sincerely,  
Yours in Conservation

JOHN R. STANARD

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2947 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Black,

I would like to make the following comments on the Draft General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

I am opposed to the Wilderness proposal.

The area you propose to be classified as Wilderness has been exposed to centuries of anthropogenic impacts such as fire, large scale logging operation and grazing. All of these activities have caused dramatic changes in the composition of forested areas and local streams. The primeval characters in this area is long gone and can never be recovered.

I am disappointed with efforts of NPS to protect and restore cultural resources of the Riverways area. It appears NPS may have lost the opportunity to protect and restore significant artifacts from this area.

I suggest NPS proceed very carefully with any proposals to reduce noise within and adjacent to the Riverways.

It appears NPS is willing to adopt management alternatives that will have negative impacts on the local economy.

I am disappointed in the quality of the various studies and surveys conducted by NPS that were used to support NPS recommendations for the future. I question the validity of some of your information.

Your preferred plan (plan B) proposes to drastically reduce the use of motorized watercraft and reduce horsepower on the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers. About 34% of the Riverways will have motorized watercraft restrictions. These proposed restrictions will have serious impacts on people that fish from motorized watercraft.

It will also impact public agencies that are impowered [sic] to manage our fishery resources and provide law enforcement.

I am disappointed NPS has not fully implemented the 1984 plan.

I am opposed to Alternative A, B, and C. And suggest you continue with your no-action alternatives until you have fully implemented the 1984 Plan. I suggest you consider the suggestions of the Missouri Department of Conservation, especially comment 4.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your proposals.

Jerry Presley  
Director Emeritus  
Missouri Department of Conservation  
1988-1997

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2948 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir,

As the Texas County Farm Bureau Board of Directors. who represent farmers and ranchers of Texas County Missouri. we would like to comment on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft Management Plan.

We have approximately 600 members who unanimously support the No Action Alternative". We realize that we are

heavily outnumbered, underfunded, and unorganized compared to the people from the urban areas of this state. Please consider our story.

Texas County and surrounding counties have a Land Use Plan on file which addresses the relationship between the county, state and federal governments. This plan clearly states the position of the county when various changes are proposed for our area. It has been recognized by the courts as valid.

Major changes such as closing river crossings, changing our roads and trails, regulating river traffic and river access has a big impact on our way of life, our traditions, and our heritage as well as the economy of our area.

Our citizens rely heavily on our natural resources for our livelihood. Over the years our timber industry has had to deal with many burdensome rules and regulations. The sawmills have rules pertaining to waste disposal, mill operation. OSHA, EPA. dust and pollution, labor rules, and on and on.

Most of the oak flooring and a large amount of the railroad ties used come from these hills and valleys. Charcoal is another major product produced here in the Ozarks.

When more land is set aside for wilderness, it limits our access to harvest and manage this God given asset.

Tourism is a major concern also. Our rivers and forest are a beautiful and awesome site that we like to share with city folk. We have worked and managed these hills for over 150 years to get to what we have now. We really don't need people coming to us telling us what we are supposed to do when all they know has come from a book.

We realize that we native folks are considered unlearned, uneducated hillbillies. However we must have not done too bad if now you want to preserve what we presently enjoy.

Tourism has become a major business in our area. Please don't infringe on local control anymore than you have already.

Please honor our right to private property, and the BHI of Rights in the United States Constitution.

Therefore we recommend the No ActIon Alternative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kaylyn Dallbom  
Crittany Cook  
Joe B. Wheblinea  
Ircatess C. Keeney, DVM  
Stem Wagner  
Rovert Roure  
Lesly Holt  
Primrose Casy  
Richard Best  
DJ Wright  
John M. Skevish  
Kim Kosmick  
Donald Laussen  
Katie Miller  
John Casey  
Michael S. Luesrosen  
Nate Phil

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2949	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				

**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Bill Black,

I was not sure about sending in a comment about the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement. Then I met park superintendent Timothy Good, from Grant Historic Site south of St. Louis, MO at the Van Buren open house last evening. He assured me that he knew you and that each comment would be read, even if there were over 1,000. So here goes.

I have pictures of my Grandparents and dad in a wooden john boat on the Current river when he was a kid. My mother's family would have their family reunion each summer at Big Springs. My family was invited and attended the June 10, 1972 christening of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways by Tracia Nixon Cox throwing a bouquet of flowers into Big Springs. My husband's family also camped on the Current River enjoying fishing and floating during the day and singing around the camp fire in the evening. .

My Grandpa Sulser and his friend were featured in the July, 1947 Sports Afield magazine. They took a writer/hunter, fisherman, Charles Callison, on a gigging trip on the Current River to show him that giggers are not out to kill all the game fish.

Taking care of the Current River and surrounding area have been something that we learned growing up and continue to instill in our children and grandchildren.

Each year for 35 years my husband, Dale, and I have boated, fished, floated, hiked and camped on Current River with our family. Our favorite spot is Logyard gravel bar. I could show you pictures from 35 years ago until now and you could see that the gravel bar still looks the same. Those who live in this area are the caretakers of the river. Sure the river has changed some but this is from mother nature, not from the people who love spending an afternoon fishing, swimming, and floating. We don't need a number on a post to tell us where to camp, we camp where there is a spot open with family and friends.

There are some who think that floaters and boaters don't get along so there should be a motor limit. There have been several times when we have helped floaters collect what they lost or helped them get out of a jam. Once it was a rainy campout and here came a family floating soaked to the bone and we warmed them by our fire and took them to call to be taken out early.

We want the traditions to continue, the ones that were started 3 generations ago. Our 4 year old granddaughter caught her first goggle eye last summer. How excited she was. Singing around the campfire after a day on the river, what can be better than that. Gigging on a cold night in December and eating yellow suckers, what taste better than that.

The management statement plans to take away some of these traditions up and down the river. Please allow us to continue with our family traditions and enjoy the Current River. We and the community around us will continue to take care of the river and its surroundings as we have for generations.

Sincerely,  
Krista Hampton

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2950	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,22,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear National Ozark Scenic Riverway:				

As a lifeline canoeist and kayaker at 62 years old having floated 90% of the rivers in Missouri and rivers in Arkansas, Tenn., and N.C. and a member of the Small Mouth Alliance and Conservation Federation of Missouri. I would hate to see the Jack Fork, Eleven Point, Current and Buffalo turned into playgrounds for ATVs and mudd trucks. I feel many of the roads in sensitive areas need to be closed to curtail abuse to plant and fisheries and wildlife plus fire hazards and trash.

The horses crossing the river I don't agree with; they are doing it in such large amounts that manure and pee don't work well with fishing and aesthetics I did stream team on Joachin Creek and adjacent to our 160 acre farm and

excess nitrogen in the water makes for water pollution.

I am not saying the people around the river are all hoosiers but Eminence and the folks around those rivers need to realize they get a lot of their \$ from tourist, fisherman, and floaters. If you turn it into a sewer and abuse it the % wont be there. People from the cities and nation own and have a say in what happening there.

Thank you,  
Gary Kappler

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2951    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Re: Draft General Management Plan for Ozark National Scenic Riverways

Dear Mr. Black:

I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to be able to submit my comments to you regarding the National Park Service and to express my feelings toward the Draft General Management Plan for Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). I am writing this letter as an individual and it is not to be taken to be representative of any organization or department with which I may have an affiliation.

This plan, I feel, has been developed exclusive of local input from the citizens residing in or near the ONSR. Further, and probably more important is the exclusion of all parties that will be impacted in a negative fashion by the proposed plan. Therefore, I express my very strong opposition to this proposal and would recommend that the National Park Service enforce the current General Management Plan.

I would urge the National Park Service (NPS) to consider abolishing the proposal and moving forward with an appointed group of citizens and state agencies to develop a workable plan providing solutions to issues of concern to the NPS. I know state agencies and stakeholders would be most appreciative of having the opportunity to work with you and your staff in the development of a new General Management Plan

Again, thank you for the opportunity to present you with my comments.

Sincerely,  
Don C. Bedell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2952    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** The following is my comment on your draft plan.

I am unable to read or print the draft plan from my wife's PC. The print is too small. Don't know why we can not print.

With that info my comments are:

The Missouri Department of Natural Resources and The Missouri Department of Conservation both encourage the use of Missouri and Natural Resources it is my hope and prayer that ONSR is continuing to encourage the use of our riverways by following the example set by DNR and MDC by expanding the opportunities. Our pamphlet "floating the Ozark Rivers" giving outfitters and the multifold pamphlet in full color titled Ozark are both good encouragements to continue the use.

Now for my recollection.

I watched the Park Service purchase and take the rivers, farms, homes, and livelihood (being a farmer). It was difficult for my Father's first cousin as he lost his farm. He could not find a replacement. My father Hulbert Rader

his first cousin David Pummill.

I have floated the full length of both rivers as a professional fishing guide with a guides license from both Mo and Ark, and also personal floats. Also have done many floats on Eleven Point.

Please continue to encourage use of Missouri's Natural Resources as MDC and DNR do.

Sincerely,

Jerome Radar

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2953	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent,				

My mobile phone didn't allow me to comment online, therefore, I want to make sure with this note I am "voting."

Changes needed to be made. Motorboat traffic on the river last summer make it nearly impossible for me to float a canoe. The wakes from the boat nearly capsized me ALL DAY LONG. Worst was the sheriff speeding along with the boats front and in the air!

Another time all the horses in the river, lots partying and fireworks made it impossible to sleep on a gravel bar. Noise traveled until 2am scaring wildlife towards us. Bear in campsite!!

I vote for as many changes as possible. These rivers are being destroyed!!

Kathleen Dunford

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2954	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have spent many happy hours canoeing on the beautiful Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. Such a gem should absolutely be protected from illegal access points and horse overuse. I want the children of the future to see the rivers before they are torn up.				

Sincerely,

Joyce Lewis

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2955	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear National Park Service,				

I support what you are doing to protect the area's resources. I have canoed on both the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers... both wonderful experiences. Hope it will be here for the children's children to enjoy the wilderness.

Thank you for your planning and conservation efforts.

Sincerely,

Dianne Dickerson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2956	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 00:00:00				

**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent,

I support and I urge you to adopt alternative C. Please give C every due consideration. It is the best option for all concerned. Thanks for your consideration. I've read A, B, and C.

Sincerely,

John Judd  
4769 Cactus Wren Ct.  
St. Louis, MO 63128

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2957    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** It would be nice if you would leave the ONSR the way it is.  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2958    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** Dear Ms. Dena Matteson,

I am contacting you to voice support for adopting an updated National Park Service General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I represent no organizations, only myself and several other local folks and visitors from around the area who frequent the ONSR. This letter does not specify a chosen Alternative but rather is intended as general support for a GMP update that allows the NPS to better patrol and preserve the scenic nature of the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers. Many of us will be submitting additional comments and specific suggestions independently.

Please see attached PDF for full description of our support and list of co-signers.

Respectfully,

--

JOHN WHITAKER Associate AIA /// LEED AP BD C  
Chapel Hill//Raleigh//Durham NC  
817 821 0230

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2959    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Park Service: Please consider my support for the park services Alternative B as described in the STL Post Dispatch, January 26, 2014 article. It seems balanced to please both land owners and the general public (me) as a national park. The area is unique but is in danger of over use and destruction. I have floated the river and hope it will remain for my relatives in the future. Beer bongos, nudity and violence- -a man was shot this past year by a landowner. I am incredulous of the sheer numbers of people using the river. It needs to be managed in some way as to limit the amount of canoes and people per day. The canoe rentals could be used to control as a start. The access points could be patrolled and limited. Livestock and wheeled vehicles should not be allowed to pollute this stream. It is not infinite and could be debased to a point where no longer a treasure of nature or a source of pleasure for those who float the stream. Please use all the power of the US park service to plan and implement permits, procedures and even levy costs for entry if necessary. Nature's beauties are for all to use although those who were there first may feel ownership (although inaccurate).

Sincerely, Emily LaBarge

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2960    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** for some reason I couldn't leave a comment on the webpage tonight. Please forward this.



1-22-14

This evening I was very disappointed when I arrived at the powder valley nature center to attend this evenings open house and was greeted by a Kirkwood police officer at the entrance to the area only to be turned away due to the over crowding of the facility. Apparently the facility was at occupancy, and there were folks outside in the cold, unable to enter. The officer was very polite, and informed me that I could walk up the hill to the building, but in all likelihood, would not be able to enter the open house due to occupancy restrictions.

I have been a park user all of my life and very much enjoy the current status quo. I strongly object to the restrictions described in alternative A. If a change in the status quo is going to happen, then would prefer either the B or C options.

My observations of the use of the park is that during the 3 summer holiday weekends, the park is at or exceeds capacity. Fortunately, this occurrence is limited to these 9 days a year. The other summer weekends can be busy, but not intolerable. As to the fall, winter and spring seasons, the park is very peaceful. My concerns are restrictions could likely be imposed on the users of the park for the full calendar year due to the park being "over loved" on 9 days of the year.

As to specifics:

HP limits. Option C is preferred with the exception of the banning of motors in the upper portions of the streams, in these locations I would prefer the restrictions remain unchanged.

Gravel bar camping: Status Quo preferred.

Thanks for all the hard work that has gone into this study, it is very well written and extremely informative. I particularly enjoyed the history of the Ozarks and the Current river region. I visited the river this past weekend and i am always amazed at the solitude of the river and region in general in the winter. What a beautiful country we live in.

Thanks for doing your part in helping to keep this country a great place, but, please keep it accessible to folks of all ages and abilities. Further restrictions of access points will likely cause increased concentration of users at the fewer available points decreasing the experience of those who are unable to float the river and camp on a primitive gravel bar sites.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2961	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	E-mail				

**Correspondence:** I am writing as a concerned citizen of Missouri. Leave the Current and Jack Fork Rivers alone. Use the No-Action Alternative. Put ALL Missouri park and river lands back into the hands of we in Missouri. Make the National Park Service GO AWAY. We can do our own Park Planning. Thank you for considering this.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2962	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,02,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				

**Correspondence:** 2870 Mill Creek Terrace  
Colombia, MO 65203  
November 22, 2013

William N. Black, Superintendent  
Ozark National Scenic Riverways  
P.O. Box 490  
Van Buren, MO 63965

Dear Mr. Black:

Since protection/Stewardship of our resources is imperative it was with relief and approval to read the alternative plan your organization has chosen to uphold.

Please know you have the support of my husband, my son, and me in this approach.

Sincerely,

Marcelle Bennett

Constant vigilance against even little encroachments of the rules/standards is critical.

MB

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2963    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern:  
The picture on this card says it all - a beautiful river, as is the Current R.

I'm writing to support Plan B - I do not want to destroy the livelihood of the people on the river, but I do want to save the river. Some management is necessary - the gravel bars and spawning beds are being damaged. Ecoli levels are very high. Lets work together for a win-win situation, but foremost save the beauty and integrity of the Current River.

Sincerely,

Judy Jung - also a volunteer at the MO. Wildlife Rescue Center.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2964    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** 1/10/14

Dear Superintendent,

I support alternative A. The most aggressive approach at protecting the Current/Jacks Fork Rivers. I realize this may be a compromise for some, but I believe alternative A offers the only approach to ensuring the long term health of the river and the wild life it supports. I love this area and feel committed it is protected. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Sandy Kapka  
2965 W. 123 Terrace  
Leawood, KS 66209

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2965    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,30,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** 12/27/13

"Feedback on Rivers Plan"

Ozark National Scenic Riverways

To start out with, in 1983 I floated both the Current and Jack's Fork River. To say the least I was overwhelmed by the beauty and primeval nature of the ecosystem. Even at that time (30 years ago), I was also appalled at the large number of canoes and the party like atmosphere on the river (Beer cans in the river along with trash on the bars and in the river). Also canoers not showing respect for other canoers on the river. That was 30 years ago - I can only speculate what its like 30 years later. Another concern I have is that I've heard the ecosystem is overrun with uncaring ATV user and cattle and horse manure washing into the river. The river is not only for the benefit and the \$ profit of the local community and residents. The rivers and the ecosystem belong to all of us and should be managed for the long-term integrity and benefit of all (including wildlife). I was also saddened and angered when I heard the

Jack's Fork has been dredged for gravel on its banks and bars (causing erosion). It sounds like the locals have driven a political and economic wedge in how the ecosystem is managed. It sounds like the economic and financial factors are weighted heavily in the management of the rivers and ecosystem. Long-term planning is a must. This jewel in the Ozarks must not be compromised or plundered. Thank you for seriously listening and taking my thoughts and ideas into consideration. In the future may I hear good news and positive things about the future of Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Thank You.

Sincerely,

Rick J. Myers

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2966    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent:

I am writing to ask you to support Alternative B regarding the General Management Plan (GMP) for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in southern Missouri.

My wife and I, plus our two daughters, have had many years of enjoyment from the rivers of Missouri, and we would like future generations to have that same joy.

Thanks for considering my views.

Sincerely,

Peter Catalano

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2967    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black,

Thank you and your staff for all of the hard work you have put in over the last several decades in building, maintaining and working to preserve the Current and Jacks Forks for our future generations. Regarding the General Management Plan, I ask that you stand firm and consistent with the original purpose of the National Park Act of 1916 "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

I respectfully request that you adopt Alternative A. I believe that it provides the best protections for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways of the three proposed options. I strongly support closing illegal roads and restoring natural conditions, closing undesignated horse trails, and restricting vehicle and horse access to gravel bars. My grandkids have had bad experiences on the gravel bars due entirely to the damage and contamination from horses. I hope you can improve the rivers so that they will have a great and safe experience decades from now when they take their kids and grand-kids on the Current and Jacks Fork, and Buffalo Rivers.

I am also becoming more and more concerned about the E-Coli contamination of your streams, and I hereby request that you start a regular program of testing the river's contamination and water quality on a regular basis at several fixed points along each stream and continue to monitor and develop a database of these readings for future reference and stream quality management. Please keep these rivers safe for our kids and grandkids.

Thank You,

Edward Gross & Family

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2968    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent,

I prefer Alternative A for the GMP of the ONSR. I oppose the use of motorized boats & equestrian use on & in the rivers in the park. This park's problems have included the seemingly ever-expanding presence of motorized vehicles and their maze of eroded tracks in riparian areas and on gravel bars; the explosive growth of equestrian use and proliferation of undesignated trails and river crossings (many of which are in sensitive riverine areas or on steep, heavily-eroded slopes); overcrowding in certain reaches of the rivers and resulting conflicts among user groups, coupled with the rowdy behavior of some visitors; and inadequate monitoring and enforcement of scenic easements.

I believe Plan A will decrease the number of access points and close illegally developed roads/trails. It will limit the horse power of motorboats above Two Rivers. Plan A provides better usage of the rivers by horses and motorizes boats. It limits access to the rivers by motorized vehicles except on official roads. It eliminates illegal horse trails and reduces river crossings. These changes reduce E Coli contamination and make the rivers safer for swimming. Plan A proposes reasonable gravel bar usage and stops the damage and contamination by horses. This will have the potential to restore gravel bars to their natural state.

Plan A has the best chance of reversing the harmful effects on the rivers and returning them to the condition they were in when the Scenic Riverways was established.

Anne M. Hussar

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2969 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** It's Our Back Yard

Dear Riverways Superintendent Bill Black,

Let me start by introducing myself. My name is Charles Stewart and I am a 34 year old father of two. I reside in Reynolds County Missouri. I am very proud to live in such a naturally rich region of the great state of Missouri. Those natural resources are the very foundation of my concern and the reason I am drafting this letter. I am sure that you are aware of the latest proposals to change the regulations concerning the management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Changes to the regulations along the 134 miles of the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers will have a tremendous impact on the counties, towns, and people that call this region home. The Federal Park Service has released three proposals that range from extreme changes to no changes of the existing regulations. If I was forced to choose one of these proposals it would definitely be the one outlining no change. Rather than be forced into a proposal drafted by the national government I am proposing that the national government release its control of the Ozark Riverways and allow the state of Missouri to make the decisions concerning one of its greatest natural resources.

I have been a resident of Missouri for twenty years. I have witnessed, first hand, Missouri's ability to manage its vast park system. According to an editorial written by Lt. Governor Peter Kinder, "Missouri has a robust state park system, which has been ranked as one of the top four state park systems in the nation. In its 87 state parks and historic sites, Missouri has more than 200,000 acres available to the public. The state does an outstanding job preserving forests, prairies, springs, streams, and lakes."(Kinder) I couldn't agree more! Missourians are proud to have such great parks and the natural resources those parks protect. The state of Missouri has found a balance that allows not only its citizens but visitors to the state, the privilege to enjoy the state's natural resources.

Reynolds County is only one of several that rely heavily on the revenue created by the Jacks Fork and Current rivers. Other counties include; Dent, Shannon and Carter, just to name a few. The towns that originated along the banks of these rivers have long used tourism to generate revenue. This revenue helps to maintain the thousands of miles of country roads used by the people who live in these counties. Many businesses depend on the cash flow that wouldn't exist

if the National Park Service denies access to the rivers and the surrounding land. The evidence of this fact was clear during last year's federal government shut down. During an interview with the Kansas City Star, Joe Devall (owner of Silver Arrow Canoe Rental), said, "The shutdown has had a dramatic impact on my business", which is a National Park Service concessionaire south of Salem. "We don't have any business", Devall said, adding it would violate his contract to even shuttle anyone to access points on the Current River. He said he normally has a brisk business this time of year but he's had to turn people away. (Kansas City Star) This was only one of the hundreds of businesses affected. Not only did the government shutdown affect visitors, it affected the locals.

The evidence of opposition to my proposal is equally clear. Town hall meetings have been held to obtain opinions on the proposals that the federal government released. It's not uncommon to see supporters of the most extreme proposal to completely shut down access to the rivers and the abutting land. The problem with this opposition is that many of these supporters have never seen nor heard of these rivers prior to the proposals being released to the public. This is just bad news for the people who consider the Ozark Riverways their back yard. Opinions from people who have no idea what shutting these rivers down to the public would mean for the surrounding communities have no place in this discussion.

I mentioned earlier that I was a father of two. I have enjoyed raising my two children in a region where it is possible to enjoy Mother Nature at her finest. Thousands of other local families and the families of regular visitors to the area would surely agree. Not only do the Ozark Riverways bring revenue to the inhabitants of the Ozarks, but they bring peace and joy to people's hearts. This reason alone should be enough for the federal government to see that releasing control of the Ozark Riverways back to Missouri is in the best interest of those who matter the most, Missourians and the visitors we welcome into our back yards.

I sincerely hope that you will give my proposal some serious thought. I understand that the Federal Park Service wants to protect the Ozark Riverways but I truly feel that Missouri could be equally effective doing so without jeopardizing the rights of all who enjoy these natural paradises.

God Bless,  
Charles M. Stewart

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2970    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Superintendent,  
Alternative A! Alternative A! Alternative A!  
Read Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper 2048 Protect the National Riverway. Don't open the Park to more problems with more horses, more motorboats, more access points, more ATV's.

The Park was preserved for all Americans. The "canoe capital" will suffer with increased problems from expanded horse trails, 700 miles is enough if not too much!

Don Horton

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2971    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

This constitutes the response of the Cave Research Foundation (CRF) to the proposed Ozark Riverways Draft General Management Plan. CRF believes that usage patterns that have developed over the last thirty years have had a degrading impact on the natural resources of the park. Specifically:

- Excessive canoe usage on certain stretches has caused problems of bank erosion, trash, and vandalism.
- Excessive power boat usage has caused erosion issues, negative effects on the habitat of the Ozark hellbender, high noise levels, water quality issues, and a general degradation of the visitor experience.
- A poor trail system limits alternative forms of non-motorized recreation.
- Unrestricted horse usage has had many negative impacts on soils, erosion, visitor experience, and water quality.
- The tremendous growth of off-road vehicular use has also negatively affected many of the values of the park. In our experience, for example, the Jam-Up Cave area (a designated natural area) has been greatly affected. Rough trails which were rarely used in, say, 1980 have become roads and, to a certain extent, institutionalized.
- Increased numbers of maintained roads has not resulted in higher levels of visitor enjoyment. Traditional family usage has dropped during the years we have been involved with the park.
- Scenic easements have been widely violated without enforcement.
- Traditional usage of the rivers, the intent of the park enabling legislation, has been replaced by too much high-volume and disruptive usage patterns.

#### Wilderness

We favor wilderness designation for the Big Spring primitive area. The present usage patterns would not change much but designation would provide an accessible wilderness for families in a safe environment. Such a designation, along with attendant trailheads, would stimulate visitation to the area and provide an economic stimulus to the area.

#### Alternatives to General Management

The no-action "alternative" should not be considered because, basically, it would continue practices that are currently illegal and against NPS policy. This would result in degraded visitor experience which eventually would have a severe impact on the economic base of the surrounding communities.

We favor Alternative B with some important modifications.

-Because high usage and large numbers of access points have caused considerable problems, we do not support keeping the present number of access points. We favor reducing these to a manageable level. Many of these access points were not usable thirty years ago, and a return to that status is needed. For example, on the upper Jacks Fork, concession-available access points are only needed at a very few sites:

Buck Hollow, Bay Creek, and Alley Spring.

- We support the creation of new concession opportunities for non-motorized activities. The potential exists for shuttle service for backpackers as trails continue to be built in the river corridor.
- Horse trails should be limited to old road beds where degradation can be minimized. However, a joint backpacking and horse trail should be considered utilizing old roads on the upper Current River. Such a trail could go from Round Spring all the way to Cedargrove.
- We do not support the creation of new horse camps unless they are remote camps, utilized for overnight trips, or unless they replace current, unauthorized, unmaintained social camps. Otherwise off park facilities would be beneficial to the local community. Horse camps are not a low-maintenance item and a proliferation of them will likely degrade natural resources.
- We support the creation of a learning center at Powder Mill, provided that does not reduce the usage of the present research center, which is not mentioned. CRF occasionally keeps the present center open as a visitor

contact point, with good results. The research center has enabled thousands of hours to be volunteered in the interest of park natural resource management. The wording of the GMP alternative says that "some living quarters" "might" be provided. This should be reworded if the intent is to keep the research center element. If the intent would be to remove the research center, then we would certainly be in opposition to that.

-Wording should be added that addresses partnering with "volunteers and others" to accomplish natural resource stewardship projects; that language was used for "cultural" resource projects but no mention was made of natural resource partnerships, which are ongoing at this time. The ongoing partnership with CRF and others has provided for effective management of cave resources within the park. Not mentioning this type of natural resource partnership is an oversight, one that could potentially be interpreted as unauthorized.

-We do not favor the horsepower limits as delineated in Alternative B. Specifically, we believe that horsepower limits be lowered on the Current River between Pulltite and Two Rivers. We suggest 25 horsepower limits between Two Rivers and Round Spring, and no motors allowed at all above Round Spring. If high-horsepower usage is reduced on these stretches then canoe traffic can be redistributed to these sections, as was the case in the 1970's. Family camping on the stretch of river between Round Spring and Two Rivers has just about vanished due to the high usage by powerboats, day and night.

-Depending on the spread and disposition of White Nose Syndrome, CRF supports the opening of such caves as can handle traffic. However, visitation of caves should never be considered to be of high recreational value. Most OZAR caves are either: too small to be of recreational interest, too geologically or biologically sensitive, or are technical in nature requiring specialized equipment or skills.

-Under Alternative B it is said that no FTE increase in Resource Management and Science will be needed despite additional responsibilities and duties. We cannot agree with this statement. For example, Ozark Riverways has the largest karst springs of any national park unit, and yet there is no physical science or hydrologist or geologist position. This should be changed in the final plan and a goal made to create a physical science position through the addition of one FTE in natural resources.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,  
Scott House  
Ozarks Operation Manager

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2972    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Official Comment on the NPS draft GMP for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways  
12.19.2013

On behalf of Environment Missouri's more than 13,000 supporters, activists, and members, we applaud the National Park Service for releasing a draft General Management Plan that offers the potential for the restoration and protection of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and we urge them to adopt Alternative "A" in lieu of their preferred alternative.

Nearly fifty years ago, the people of Missouri entrusted two of their most spectacular rivers to the NPS. The agency established the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, the first-ever national park created exclusively to protect a river and its watershed. The NPS promised to take a snapshot of the rivers in 1964 and preserve them in that condition for future generations. Unfortunately, that didn't happen. Decades of mismanagement and neglect have taken their toll on the parks. According to current estimates, access points on the rivers-places where the foliage has been broken in order to allow access by trucks, ATVs and RVs-have proliferated from the original dozen or so official points to over 130. Rather than use the 23 miles of parkdesignated horse trails, designed to minimize equestrian impact on water quality and maximize the safety and enjoyment of all park visitors, local horse operators guide tours on over 80 miles of trails. This has resulted in e. Coli impairment on the Jacks Fork. Overcrowding, scenic easement violations, and a general "anything goes" atmosphere all contribute to the degradation

of the wilderness surrounding the rivers, the quality of the water in the rivers, and the overall park experience.

This is unacceptable. These are among the most beautiful rivers on the planet, and the park is one of the few wild places where people can explore a world-class spring system. The NPS is supposed to protect and preserve the beautiful places that make America such a natural wonderland. Their failures to enforce the previous management plan, and the overall inadequacy of the 1984 plan itself, are a failure to respect the wishes of the citizens of Missouri, who consider these rivers the gems of the state; and the wishes of all Americans, who rely on the NPS to ensure that our nation's special places remain special.

Visitors to the park-the vast majority of them from outside the Ozarks and outside of the state-are the single biggest contributors to the economies of Shannon, Carter and Dent counties, which rank among the most impoverished in the state. Should the rivers lose their natural charm, people will stop visiting. And if people stop visiting, the communities that live along the river will suffer economically.

Further, the park provides critical habitat for the Ozark Hellbender, an endangered salamander unique to Southern Missouri. Worsening water quality (an unavoidable result should the NPS fail to take adequate action) could result in the extinction of this 65 million year old species. Fortunately, the NPS has listened to community leaders, small businesses, environmental groups, and nearly 15,000 petitions from locals, Missourians, and people from across the country, who have asked for stronger protections for Missouri's river gems.

We congratulate the NPS on their decision to appoint Bill Black as Superintendent of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Superintendent Black has done an excellent job righting some of the long-standing wrongs that have tarnished the park's reputation. However, his ability to do so is hampered by the 1984 GMP, which was inadequate when it went into effect nearly 30 years ago and is seriously outdated now.

The draft GMP that the NPS has released shows that they've heard what we've known for years-that the vast majority of Missourians think that the Current and Jacks Fork rivers deserve the protection and preservation that the NPS promised when they established the park. We urge the NPS to make their first priority in choosing an alternative the restoration of the Current and Jacks Fork to their 1964 conditions. We urge them to focus on preserving the wild nature of the rivers and traditional Ozarks heritage, as well as fostering deeper communication and understanding between park staff, the locals, and the people who travel from around the world to enjoy the park's spectacular beauty.

We urge the NPS to adopt Alternative "A", which provides the strongest protections for the rivers and does the most to establish deeper, more meaningful connections between the NPS, the region, and the park's visitors.

Alternative "A" does the least violence to the National Environmental Protection Act and conforms more closely to the original intent of the NPS to "take a snapshot of the river" and keep it in a similar state for future generations to enjoy. Further, Alternative "A" does the most to address many long-standing issues with the park, and puts into place protections that will ensure that the rivers are as beautiful twenty years from now as they were twenty years ago.

Alternative "A" accomplishes these goals through an aggressive plan to close roads and illegal access points and to provide equestrian experiences that allow horse-riders and boaters alike safe enjoyment of the park. Alternative "A" provides for the management of almost 3,500 acres of the Big Springs area as wilderness and places sensible limits on boat horsepower on ecologically-sensitive parts of the river. Alternative A better manages access points on the river, increases the number of hiking trails in the park, and provides the most cultural engagement with traditional Ozarks folkways.

Further, Alternative "A" does the most to engage the public with the park, by providing a large number of experiences designed to educate visitors on natural features and Ozarks heritage.

Alternative "A" allocates the most resources to the enforcement of the rules that keep the park the special, safe and beautiful place that attracts millions of people from around the world each year to the Ozarks. Alternative "A" also seeks to develop an official "friends group" that would foster greater communication between the NPS, the communities that live along the rivers, and people that return to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways year after year.

Our more than 13,000 members, supporters, and activists we thank the NPS for taking the first



steps towards addressing serious issues that have plagued one of our nation's greatest natural parks for decades. On behalf of those who have enjoyed the park since its establishment and on behalf of the future generations of Americans who will come to the Current and Jacks Fork rivers to canoe, hike, swim, fish, and experience the Ozarks, we urge the NPS to adopt Alternative "A" and protect the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for the next twenty years.

Sincerely and with great appreciation,  
Stuart P. Keating  
State Advocate  
Environment Missouri

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2973    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** GARY HONEYCUTT  
1059 Co Rd 950  
Wasola, MO 65773  
ph 417-265-0008

Good Day Mr. Black

I hope you read all this letter and begin to be led by the spirit of God to make your decisions in time to Come because this earth belongs to the one who created it, he is the one to make decisions about it as man reads his word read PSALMS 104:5 who laid the foundations of the earth that it should not be removed forever, Ecclesiastes, chapter 1 verse 4 says one generation passeth away and another generation cometh BUT THE EARTH ABIDETH FOREVER NO GLOBAL WARMING to Destroy it, Back to PSALMS 104:11 He sendeth the springs into the VALLEYS which run among the hills, they give drink to every beast cattle etc of the field, the wild asses quench their thirst IF We fail to make our decisions according to what Gods word says this is what his word says and I did not write it PSALMS 34:15 The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous and his ears are open unto their Cry 34:16 says the face of the Lord is against them that do evil, to cut off the Remembrance of them from the earth, and I am not writing these things to threaten or Condemn you I am writing them to help you and our land I dont think man should clutter it up with trash beer bottles glass etc but there needs to be middle ground, whats wrong with taking pictures God dont care he gave man the technology to make cameras, he didnt intend for someone to charge for it. We have plot maps I didnt charge for man to take a picture of my farms

Also Jesus was baptized in the River of Jordan Matthew 3:13 people are still being Baptized today in Jordan River God created the Rivers for Man to be Baptized in, he told all Believers to be Baptized Jesus or John either one did not have to pay to use the River, God anoints his people today with his spirit he says do not touch mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm, and he said if you offend one of my little ones it would be better for you if you had a millstone be tied around your neck and be cast into the sea, and again sir, I am not trying to condemn you but not me but God is going to judge America for wrongdoing I dont know if you believe in Prophets, but I have heard that there has been at least 2 prophets said God told them that New York would be hit by a Bomb, one said it would be in OBAMS time in office, I believe that Government of Man is trying to take over our freedom, not making godly decisions, but if it not of God it will be destroyed READ ISIAH 9:6 God will have last say.

THE RIGHTIOUS SHALL INHERIT THE EARTH THEY SHALL NEVER BE REMOVED

Thanks for reading my letter

Gary Honeycutt

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2974    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Superintendent Ozark National Scenic Riverways,

We the Dent County Commission, in regards to the Draft General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, would like to submit the following comments.

The Dent County Commission supports the "No Action Alternative." We feel the "No Action Alternative" allows the Park Service to continue management of the Riverways in accordance with the current management plan which provides the National Park Service more than enough authority to meet the needs and concerns of all of us who use and love our Current and Jacks Fork Rivers.

The Dent County Commission is strongly opposed to Alternatives A, B, and C, as all the proposals call for increased restrictions on motorboat uses that in some instances would only serve to end gigging and trapping on these rivers, particularly on the upper reaches. The history of gigging and trapping on the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers using boats with small motors pre-dates the early 1960's establishment of the Riverways by many, many years and poses no threat or conflict what-so-ever to any other users of the Riverways or to the health of the Riverways themselves. The Dent County Commission also strongly opposes the goals of Alternatives A, B, and C to close or eliminate several miles of roads, trails and accesses to the Riverways, which only serves to further restrict local historical uses of the rivers and will result in forcing more and more people to congregate on smaller and more crowded access points.

We also would like to state our opposition to the Wilderness Area Designation.

Further, the Dent County Commission would like to express our overall extreme disappointment in the Draft General Management Plan produced by the Park Service and our anger over the National Park Service conduct at the 4 public meetings held by the Park Service to discuss it.

It is clear the National Park Service totally ignored local input and concerns about the Riverways when constructing this Draft Plan and Park Service staff openly and blatantly attempted to influence those in attendance at all of the public meetings to support the restrictive Alternatives A, B, or C by telling attendees the "No Action Alternative" was really not an alternative at all.

It is readily apparent the National park Service has skewed this entire process and proposal.

How unfortunate!

Sincerely,  
Presiding Commissioner, Darrell Skiles  
Associate Commissioner Dist. #1 Dennis Purcell  
Associate Commissioner Dist #2 Gary Larson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2975	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent,				

My mobile phone didn't allow me to comment online, therefore, just to make sure with this note I am "voting".

Changes needed to be made. Motorboat traffic on the river last summer made it nearly impossible for me to float a canoe. The wakes from the boat nearly capsized me ALL DAY LONG. Worst was the sheriff speeding along with the boats front end in the air!

Another time all the horses in the river, loud partying and fireworks made it impossible to sleep on a gravel bar. Noise traveled until 2am. Scaring wildlife towards us. Bear in campsite!!

I vote for as many changes as possible. These rivers are being

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2976	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				

**Correspondence:** Re: Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan

I am writing on behalf of East Ozarks Audubon Society, a Chapter of National Audubon based in Farmington, Missouri, serving six counties and with a membership of approximately 160. Before making my comments on the ONSR Draft Management Plan, I'd first like to make some general comments about the process.

There has been a good deal of opposition to the NPS proposals expressed by local politicians and to a lesser extent from the populace of the counties surrounding the Riverways. I believe the extent of local opposition is overblown and I think the politician's opposition is largely opportunistic, driven by a radical anti-government ideology. Although I did not speak publicly, I did attend the Van Buren open house and found the forum to be extremely intimidating to anyone not in conformance with the Tea-Party line which amounted to: the government cannot put any restrictions on use of the river; the National Park Service is illegitimate; give control of the Riverways back to the State and counties. The meeting was badly managed in that the spokesman for Representative Smith was allowed to give an opening speech which frankly amounted to rabble rousing, thus setting a hostile tone, and other politicians were happy to follow that example. There was no attempt by the moderator to encourage a respectful exchange of opinions, indeed no attempt at moderation! I personally know of many people who broadly support the proposed changes who stayed away from the Van Buren meeting because they feared the scenario that in fact developed. This anti-government ideology is extremely unhelpful to the National Park Service Riverways managers and I firmly believe it does not represent the views of a large majority of Riverways users and visitors: despite the wishes of the more extreme elements, the Riverways belong to the people of the United States, not solely to the citizens of Shannon and Carter Counties. As you point out in the Draft Plan, the "no action" scenario is a baseline against which to measure the management proposals, not a rational or practical alternative. Maintaining the status quo is simply unacceptable.

Turning to specifics of the plan.

**Motorboats:** At present there is no stretch of stream in the entire State of Missouri where a canoeist can enjoy an outdoor experience free of motor boat traffic and noise. Upper reaches of float streams which used to be impractical for power boat access are now wide open to jet boats. When Leonard Hall wrote his famous book, *Stars Upstream*, motors were 10 hp and users like him would spend a week going down the river versus today when high-powered boats engage in hourly back and forth maneuvers over long stretches of the rivers. The management plan alternatives are probably the only opportunity in the foreseeable future for establishing a motor-free zone for those who seek a primitive outdoor experience free of urban noise. Canoeists and kayakers now vastly out-number motorboat recreationists, but a single jet boat can drastically impair the enjoyment and even the safety of 100 floaters in a short period of time. Of course the motor boat users are protesting loudly but your mandate as managers is to balance the interests of conflicting user groups, and the proposed plan does just that.

A notion has surfaced recently that motor-boat traffic makes canoeing safer, That is ludicrous and objectionably patronizing - the opposite is true. Canoeists willingly accept the risks inherent in any outdoor activity and prefer to have at least a few short stretches of float stream free of motor noise and the reckless behavior of a minority of motor boat operators. The plan goes out of its way to accommodate motor boat users by continuing to permit hp limits in excess of federal guidelines. We are willing to accept this in exchange for motor free zones.

Therefore, we support Alternative A regarding the extent of motor-free zones and other motor limitations. This is a long enough stretch of river to allow for a high quality recreational experience for river users, the majority of whom are canoeists, while not restricting access to the middle and lower rivers for motor boaters.

**Horse Management:** With a few exceptions, we support Alternative B which provides for 35 miles of newly designated trails (in addition to the current 23 miles of existing trails) while closing 65 miles of undesignated trails. Horseback riding is a legitimate and appropriate activity in the Riverways and we support its continuation, but as you well know in recent years the numbers of riders has grown out of control. When the volume of traffic is enough to result in serious trail and river bank erosion and in the degradation of water quality to the point where portions of a National Scenic River are unsafe for human contact, something is badly out of balance. We are concerned that many of the illicit trails are in riparian zones, thereby endangering bird nesting and feeding habitats.

Closing the illegal trails will go some way towards mitigating the problems, and establishing a permitting system is crucial when the volume of traffic is so high. Again, the horse riders are protesting vocally, but comments that access to the Park is being denied ring very hollow when legal access to Park trails will increase under the proposal. The NPS has a legal mandate to balance recreation against preservation of the resource and cannot accede to every demand for unregulated access. In the unlikely event that the "No Change" option end up being selected, we would ask that the NPS vigorously limit horseback riding to the 23 miles and that further use of un designated trails be stopped. We do not support the establishment of a new horse camp on the upper Jacks Fork. There are massive commercial horse camps serving the Riverways and we do not see the need for an NPS-managed camp. Among other problems, an additional camp is only likely to exacerbate the overuse problem, will risk degrading water quality in the pristine upper Jacks Fork and will further strain an already understaffed management system. If a horse camp is to become part of the Riverways, it should be in a site well away from river access and in a site that will not encourage new trail-making.

While mainly supporting the Alternative B, we would urge an added proviso: since traffic will probably continue to be heavy enough to degrade water quality, horses should be required to wear manure bags, at least during river crossings. The recommendation that riders are asked to stop their horse 100 feet from the stream to allow it to defecate and urinate is badly inadequate - you can lead a horse to the stream bank but you can't make it pee!

Vehicular access: One of the worst aspects of the status quo is the uncontrolled proliferation of unauthorized "traces" - illegal routes established or expanded by ORV traffic - which permeate the Riverways top to bottom and result in even the remotest gravel bars being invaded by trucks and ATVs. The complaint that NPS is trying to ban access to the rivers by trying to establish some modest measure of control is patently ridiculous; all alternatives allow for a generously high density of legal access points. We strongly support the management plan call in all the alternatives for the closure and restoration of illegal roads. With regard to access points, we support Alternative A, which does not call for additional legal access points; there is already a more than sufficient high density of legal access that, protests aside, no-one's access to the Riverways is seriously impeded.

Big Springs Wilderness Management: There is no rational reason that there should be such vociferous opposition to the proposal for wilderness management of the Big Springs tract. Those calling for the no action alternative would continue to see the tract managed as de facto wilderness, and the preferred alternative calls for very little change in management other than that public access would be somewhat enhanced if the existing closed road is converted to a hiking trail. There seems no rationale for the opposition other than the opponents dislike wilderness on principle and distrust the government - that is no basis for rational management. We support either of Alternatives A or B.

Hiking Trails: ONSR is seriously deficient in hiking trails; this is in part because the linear nature of the park and the patchwork ownership pattern within the authorized boundaries make the development of trails difficult. Nevertheless we believe insufficient effort has been put into catering to hikers and backpackers and would like to see some longer trails developed in collaboration with neighboring agencies (MDC, DNR, Pioneer Forest, etc. In our view, none of the alternatives propose an adequate increase in hiking opportunities.

Research: The draft plan acknowledges the importance of research to properly manage the resources, but we are concerned about the plan to convert the one existing structure for visiting researchers - the Powder Mill building - to a visitors' center. We understand that the lodging for researchers would be retained but the office space currently used by researchers would be lost. Having spent many hours of volunteer labor conducting cave and karst related research in the Riverways I can personally attest to the usefulness of that office space. We are sympathetic with the notion of increasing visitor education and interaction but we hope that some way can be found to accommodate this without compromising research capability, e.g., we encourage the construction of a new visitor's center at Powder Mill.

Staffing levels: We applaud the notion of increased law enforcement and increased resource management but realistically, in the present Congressional atmosphere of austerity and government cut-backs we see little prospect for additional funding. We therefore believe it would be wise to opt for Alternative A or B or some combination thereof rather than the more staffing-intensive Alternative C. We would also like to see more NPS personnel in the field and fewer performing bureaucratic tasks in the office.

Conclusion: In summary, we support a modified combination of Alternatives A and B with a few changes as outlined above. The "No Action Alternative" is a prescription for continued and escalating problems in the Riverways. The National Park Service is to be complemented for coming up with reasonable alternatives in the Draft Management Plan, any of which would be preferable to continuing on with the current host of problems. We trust that the NPS managers will stick to their guns and institute the very positive management strategies being proposed and not bow to undue pressure from those whose attitude is purely negative. Otherwise we really might as well convert this national treasure to a series of degraded county parks.

Sincerely,  
Michael Sutton  
EOAS Conservation Committee

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2977    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,26,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** REGARDS: Two Major Comments Concerning Ozark Scenic Riverways General Plan Alternatives

The National Park Service will find during the comments period that there will be overwhelming opposition to their preferred alternative plan that drastically restricts access of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to the Missourians who depend on the area for their socio-economic existence. However, after reading the National Park Service's General Plan, it was apparent that the National Park Service planners ignored two essential areas that make the entire General Plan unacceptable to review.

(1) The first area was the National Park Service's statutory duty to comply with the Federal Law which created the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The Secretary of Interior has failed to meet the requirements of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Act of 1963, by not cooperating with the State of Missouri and its political subdivisions in formulating comprehensive plans for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The result of this failure has allowed the National Park Service to produce three General Management Plans (A, Band C), that were developed by their Denver, Colorado based planning employees and a large number of consultants; of which, none represented the State of Missouri and their political subdivisions.

16 U.S.C.  
United States Code, 2011 Edition  
Title 16 - CONSERVATION  
CHAPTER 1- NATIONAL PARKS, MILITARY PARKS, MONUMENTS, AND SEASHORES  
SUBCHAPTER LXX - OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS

From the U.S. Government Printing Office, [www.gpo.gov](http://www.gpo.gov)

Â§460m-4. Cooperative land development programs; hunting and fishing

(a) Development of comprehensive plans

In furtherance of the purposes of this subchapter. the Secretary is authoriz.ed to cooperate with the State of Missouri. Its political subdivisions. and other Federal agencies and organizations In formulating comprehensive plans for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and for the related watershed of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers in Missouri. and to enter into agreements for the implementation of such plans. Such plans may provide for land use and development programs, for preservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the landscape, and for conservation of outdoor resources in the watersheds of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers.

â&#160; Consultation and Coordination with the State of Missouri amounted to the following:  
On November 15, 2010, park staff met with representatives of the Missouri State Historic Preservation Office and the Missouri Attorney General's Office. At that meeting, the park staff explained the general management planning and wilderness study process and the current phase of the plan. The state historic preservation officer was provided a copy of the Newsletter 3 (spring/summer 2009) and was informed of the preliminary alternatives that

had been developed. The National Riverways would keep the state historic preservation officer in Toirilid -a-s general management planning progresses .. (Pg. -383)

(2) The second area was the omission by the National Park Service, within the Alternative Plans, of the actual devastating effect on this area of Missouri if portions of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways become Wilderness Areas or if the National Park Service is given the authority to "prepare" the areas after Wilderness designation. Within the National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan / Wilderness Study / Environmental Impact Statement; the National Park Service admits that the General Alternative Plans are "based on research and the professional judgment of planners who have experience with similar projects. In terms of geographic scope, the impact analyses in this section primarily focus on the socioeconomic conditions of the local communities (primarily Eminence and Van Buren), and the 10 adjacent counties (Carter and Shannon counties) because this is where most impacts would be most noticeable."

A perfect comparative example of the public's actual interest in a "Wilderness Area" is the 16,000 acres of Irish Wilderness that is located only 20 miles southwest of Van Buren. The Irish Wilderness has a similar topography as the Ozark National Scenic Riverways area and also contains the Eleven Point National Wild and Scenic River. The visitor use of this area is estimated by the United States Forest Service as being 500 - 700 visits on average each year. Rather than promote a logical comparative study in the proposed Alternative Plans with the Irish Wilderness, the National Park Service totally ignored this huge underutilized area that was formed by the federal government in 1984. Such an omission by the National Park Service is incompetence at best; or at worst, a dishonest cover up of the true SocioEconomic consequences of their preferred alternative plans.

**CONCLUSION:** The only legal Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Plan is the "NO ACTION PLAN"

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2978    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,26,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** REGARDS: Two Major Comments Concerning Ozark Scenic Riverways General Plan Alternatives

The National Park Service will find during the comments period that there will be overwhelming opposition to their preferred alternative plan that drastically restricts access of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to the Missourians who depend on the area for their socio-economic existence. However, after reading the National Park Service's General Plan, it was apparent that the National Park Service planners ignored two essential areas that make the entire General Plan unacceptable to review.

(1) The first area was the National Park Service's statutory duty to comply with the Federal Law which created the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The Secretary of Interior has failed to meet the requirements of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Act of 1963, by not cooperating with the State of Missouri and its political subdivisions in formulating comprehensive plans for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The result of this failure has allowed the National Park Service to produce three General Management Plans (A, B and C), that were developed by their Denver, Colorado based planning employees and a large number of consultants; of which, none represented the State of Missouri and their political subdivisions.

16 U.S.C.

United States Code, 2011 Edition

Title 16 - CONSERVATION

CHAPTER 1- NATIONAL PARKS, MILITARY PARKS, MONUMENTS, AND SEASHORES

SUBCHAPTER LXX - OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS

From the U.S. Government Printing Office, www.gpo.gov

§460m-4. Cooperative land development programs; hunting and fishing

(a) Development of comprehensive plans

In furtherance of the purposes of this subchapter, the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the State of Missouri, its political subdivisions, and other Federal agencies and organizations in formulating comprehensive plans for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and for the related watershed of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers in Missouri, and to enter into agreements for the implementation of such plans. Such plans may provide for land use and development programs, for preservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the landscape, and for conservation of outdoor resources in the watersheds of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers.

Consultation and Coordination with the State of Missouri amounted to the following:

On November 15, 2010, park staff met with representatives of the Missouri State Historic Preservation Office and the Missouri Attorney General's Office. At that meeting, the park staff explained the general management planning and wilderness study process and the current phase of the plan. The state historic preservation officer was provided a copy of the Newsletter 3 (spring/summer 2009) and was informed of the preliminary alternatives that had been developed. The National Riverways would keep the state historic preservation officer informed as general management planning progresses. (Pg. 383)

(2) The second area was the omission by the National Park Service, within the Alternative Plans, of the actual devastating effect on this area of Missouri if portions of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways become Wilderness Areas or if the National Park Service is given the authority to "prepare" the areas after Wilderness designation. Within the National Scenic Riverway ... Draft (Kl) Management Plan / Wilderness Study / Environmental Impact Statement, the National Park Service admits that the General Alternative Plans are based on research and the professional judgment of planners who have experience with similar projects. In terms of geographic scope, the impact analyses in this section primarily focus on the socioeconomic conditions of the local communities (primarily Eminence and Van Buren), and the two adjacent counties (Carter and Shannon counties) because this is where most impacts would be most noticeable."

A perfect comparative example of the public's actual interest in a "Wilderness Area" is the 16,000 acres of Irish Wilderness that is located only 20 miles southwest of Van Buren. The Irish Wilderness has a similar topography as the Ozark National Scenic Riverways area and also contains the Eleven Point National Wild and Scenic River. The visitor use of this area is estimated by the United States Forest Service as being 500 - 700 visits on average each year. Rather than promote a logical comparative study in the proposed Alternative Plans with the Irish Wilderness, the National Park Service totally ignored this huge underutilized area that was formed by the federal government in 1984. Such an omission by the National Park Service is incompetence at best; or at worst, a dishonest cover up of the true SocioEconomic consequences of their preferred alternative plans.

CONCLUSION: The only legal Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Plan is the "NO ACTION PLAN"

Ryan Pretz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2979    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear ONSR,

Please strongly consider either Alternative A or B or a combination of the two.

We moved here from Iowa thirty-three years ago to escape dirty air and water poisoned by chemical agriculture. We bought land as did many immediately next to the Jacks Fork River, just downstream from Jam-up Cave. We lived on our land for 18 years and still own it. I got to know the area intimately. We enjoyed the clean, cold water, the numerous springs, caves and other remarkable features. I came to the conclusion many years ago that the Upper Jacks Fork is a really special place. Its semi-primitive state produces a high quality river in the downstream areas. I urge you to keep development in the Upper Jacks Fork to a minimum. It would be fatal mistake to permit any horse camps, ATV (or bike) trails or any other motorized activities. I have identified (actually seen and photographed) 29 rare, endangered or sensitive

plants just up and downstream from Jam-up Cave. I have seen several Ozark hellbenders in that region over the years and marveled over their ability to survive in such an area. Horses and motorboat traffic in that area could mean their eventual extinction. Some fools run their boats in that area during floods and even try it during low water after June. The area from Buck Hollow to Bay Creek should be reserved only for motor less and horseless transportation. Hay, straw and horse manure also bring weed seeds and the very real possibility of introducing invasive plants that would squeeze existing natives!

The Jacks fork and Current are best enjoyed in a tube, canoe or kayak and these should be a priority. 4wheel drive vehicles, ATVs and motorized campers should be kept out of the gravel bars and stream banks. Oil, gasoline and erosion by repetitive travel have no place in or on these rivers. Too often they trample vegetation whose roots stabilize gravel bars. Canoe concessioners should be the only exception to deliver and pick up canoes in very narrow corridors. Even though I am now disabled and can no longer access some of my favorite spots on these rivers, I would not ask you make exceptions for disabled people. I can rest assured they will be better protected if such vehicles are prohibited. I also think that it should be strictly enforced. On the third ticketed offense the vehicle should be confiscated and sold to help fund the enforcement of the park.

I am also calling for more funding of the ONSR! Increased funding would result in better enforcement, educational opportunities and ability to manage the park properly. These two rivers are indeed rare in the Midwest and the US and deserve all the protection we can afford. No one is making more clean water-just ask the people in West Virginia!

I am also concerned about the poor way in which the public meetings were facilitated. ONSR bent over backwards to accommodate the local people in Shannon, Dent and Carter Counties. These are NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERS; not locally owned and operated. They have remained under federal control and the only serious problems seem to originate from the areas known as the gaps in Eminence and Van Buren, where local control remains. Why can't the National Park Service be as accommodating to the rest of the nation and at least have public meetings in Columbia, Springfield and Kansas City??? By rights a meeting in Chicago should NOT be out of the question, but to cater to the local population over the city dwellers at a 3-1 ratio is grossly unfair!

Then there was the fact that many from Eminence and Van Buren packed the parking lot with trailers etc. at Powder valley trying to prevent the people in St. Louis from attending the meeting. Those people with trailers and disrupting the meeting should have been evicted from the premises.

You also seem to cater to the cheap politicians such as Lieutenant Governor Peter Kinder and 8th District Rep. Jason Smith, who were busy fanning the flames for decommissioning the ONSR and selling it to the state of Missouri. They would chose to rile up the tender feelings of how the ONSR was created and would spread vicious untruths and rumors about the Park Plan. You should have cut them off when they rambled on about decommissioning. They were supposed to comment on the topic at hand.

When people ramble on off topic they should be handed a piece of paper and the address to write their written comments, not waste the public's time at a supposed meeting open to all. These meetings were a sham!

I have committed myself to defending these rivers from polluters whether they be towns like Mt. View who released raw sewage into Jam-up Creek when their waste water treatment plant broke or when a private entity like the Missouri State Teachers Assn piling soil into Flat Rock Creek. I was relentless when Doe Run proposed six mine and mills in this area and sued the Missouri Dept. of Conservation when they illegally allowed Doe Run to explore for lead on Conservation lands. Angel and I and our Stream Team friends are YOUR best friends. We will work to make sure you have enough funding and we are here to help wherever possible.

Sincerely,  
Tom Kruzen

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2980	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				



**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent for ONSR,

I am writing to request the National Park Service give full support to Alternative A for managing and maintaining the Ozark National Scenic Riverway (ONSR). This proposed plan provides the greatest protection for the myriad of ecological, biological, geographical and hydrological features contained in the riverways and their waterways. The bottom line - without these features there is no ONSR to enjoy!

For 30 years, I have canoed, camped and hiked the ONSR, years around. My goal is to retreat from the hectic, motorized and noisy daily world temporarily. Having grown up in rural Indiana, it is an opportunity to capture a few quiet days and hear myself think once again.

The tranquil scenes where turtles sun themselves on logs; blue and green herons fish along the stream edges; frogs and peeper cals; cliff swallows, buzzards and kingfishers fly above; native flower and tress grow; fish dart beneath the water surfaces and insects, ever pesky horseflies, hover, collectively create a glimpse to a world hard to find even in the Ozark region.

So how do increased illegal roads that fragment habitat and permit unauthorized vehicular access to quiet gravel bars; churned up river sediment that negatively impacts aquatic life caused by motorized speeding boats, ATV and large numbers of horses fit into the scenic national park systems creed to protect and preserve a pristine wild area?

With regards to the January 22, Powder Valley Public Hearing, there were local people, who were turned away due to an influx of recreational trailers brought from some distance. It appears there was an organized effort to disrupt the original attempt for input from a wide audience. Limited parking prevented participation. This happened despite the multiple hearing scheduled throughout Missouri. Please use sound ecological studies to dictate policy, no rowdy rhetoric or behavior.

Sincerely yours,  
D.J. Allbright

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2981	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Re: Comments on the Draft General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways .				

I submit the following comments on the draft General Management Plan ("GMP") for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways ("ONSR") on behalf of the Center for Biological Diversity (the "Center"). The Center is a national, nonprofit conservation organization with more than 625,000 members and online activists dedicated to the protection of endangered species and wild places. The Center and its members are concerned with the conservation of imperiled species, including the endangered Ozark hellbender.

For the reasons explained below, the Center recommends that the National Park Service ("NPS") adopt the environmentally preferred alternative, Alternative A, to guide management of the ONSR. Alternative A is most protective of the ONSR's water quality, which is critical to the survival and recovery of the Ozark hellbender.

#### ONSR's Prime Recreational Waters

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways was established in 1964 as the nation's first federally-protected national river. The park extends along 134 miles (approximately 80,000 acres) of the free-flowing Current River and one of its tributaries, the lacks Fork, in the Ozark Highlands of southeastern Missouri.

The Current River and lacks Fork are prime recreational waters attracting approximately 1.5 million visitors each year. A 2011 study estimated visitor spending at more than 55 million dollars with nearly 90 percent of spending from non-local visitors. Because of this spending and

employment by the NPS, the ONSR has generated 845 jobs, which is approximately 15 percent of the total employment in Shannon and Carter counties. Accordingly, maintaining water quality is important for the local economy that depends on these waterways for recreational uses, such as boating, fishing, and floating.

As a unit of the National Park System, management of the ONSR must ensure protection of the Park's resources in an unimpaired condition for public recreation, education, and scientific value.

#### Status of Ozark Hellbenders in the ONSR

Ozark Hellbenders are endemic to the White River drainage in northern Arkansas and southern Missouri. Hellbenders are habitat specialists that depend on consistent levels of dissolved oxygen, temperature, and flow. See US. Fish and Wildlife Service, Endangered Status for the Ozark Hellbender Salamander, 76 Fed. Reg. 61956, 61,957 (Oct. 6,2011). Evidence indicates Ozark Hellbenders are declining throughout their range, and no populations appear to be stable (76 Fed. Reg. at 61,958). Likely less than 600 Ozark hellbenders remain, and the US. Fish and Wildlife Service listed the Ozark hellbender as endangered in October of 2011. 76 Fed. Reg. 61956 (Oct. 6,2011).

Historically, Ozark hellbenders could be found in portions of the Spring, White, Black, Eleven Point, and Current Rivers and their tributaries (North Fork White River, Bryant Creek, and Jacks Fork) (76 Fed. Reg. at 61,958). Currently, Ozark Hellbender populations are known to occur in Bryant Creek, North Fork of the White River, Eleven Point River, and Current River, with some individuals possibly still present in the White River, Spring River, and Jacks Fork (USFWS 2012).

In the Current River, which flows through the ONSR, it has been estimated that 80 hellbenders remain (76 Fed. Reg. at 61,960). Scientists documented Ozark hellbenders in Jacks Fork, a tributary of the Current River that flows through the ONSR, in 1992. But no hellbenders were found during investigations of Jacks Fork in 2003 nor were any found in 2006 during 7 person-hours of searching (76 Fed. Reg. at 61,960).

#### Planning Documents for Park Management

Every park in the national park system is required by law to have a current general management plan. The ONSR's last plan was done more than 25 years ago, in 1984, The 1984 General Management Plan authorizes numerous activities on the ONSR (NPS 1984). The plan called for a more detailed study of river access sites and of other roads, traces, and horse trails in the riparian corridor (Flader 2011). These studies resulted in a river management plan issued in 1989 (NPS 1989) and a roads and trails study issued in 1991 (NPS 1991). Along with the annually issued Supervisor's Compendium, these documents authorize ongoing activities on the ONSR, for example, by setting maximum use limits for canoe use, setting horsepower limits for motorboats in some areas, identifying areas on the Current River and Jacks Fork where boats can be launched, and designating which roads are open for travel.

In 2006, the NPS began the process of developing a new plan for the ONSR. On March 8,2013, the NPS provided the FWS with the draft revised GMP and Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS"). As a result of this analysis, the NPS initially concluded that the revised GMP "may affect, but not likely to adversely affect" the Ozark hellbender, Indian bat and gray bat. See Memorandum dated March 18, 2013 from Bill Black, Superintendent, Ozark National Scenic Riverways, to Amy Salveter, Field Supervisor, US. Fish and Wildlife Service.

In a letter dated April 25, 2013, the FWS explained that it could not concur with the NPS's determination. The FWS recommended that NPS conduct "a programmatic consultation in which effects from all actions occurring within the park are evaluated." See Memorandum dated April 25, 2013 from Amy Salveter, Field Supervisor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to Bill

Black, Superintendent, Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

On November 8, 2013, the NPS released the draft GMP, which is open for public comment until February 7, 2014.

#### Management of ONSR Affects the Endangered Ozark Hellbender

The Ozark hellbender is primarily affected by water quality, including sedimentation and nutrient loads. As such, any activities on the ONSR that impact water quality may in turn impact the salamander and its habitats. Ongoing activities near or on the riverways of the ONSR that deposit sediment or nutrient loads in waterways include: use of the road and trail system and recreational activities (such as boating, ATV use, and horseback riding). 76 Fed. Reg. 61,966. These activities in the rivers may also directly harm or disturb hellbenders or their cover rocks. Studies conducted by the USGS (Barks 1978), NPS and the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (1998) have suggested that "heavy recreation use is causing adverse impacts on the water quality of the Lacks Fork River, including elevated fecal coliform bacteria densities that exceed the standard for whole body contact recreation" (Vana-Miller 2007). Indeed, in May 2011, ONSR was identified as one of America's ten most endangered rivers due to inadequate management by the NPS (American Rivers 2011).

Dirt and gravel roads within the Ozarks in general are the largest source of sediments to streams, outweighing the combined impacts of pasture erosion, logging, and natural erosion (Vana-Miller 2007, citing USDA 1986). Heavily used gravel roads can contribute 100 times more sediment than paved or abandoned roads (Reid and Dunne 1984). Roads can cause marginally stable slopes to fail, and they can capture surface runoff and channel it directly into streams resulting in increased sediment deposition (Allan 1995). The 1991 NPS study of roads and trails found that the existing system of roads results in "substantial sediment loading to small creeks that empty into the Lacks Fork and Current Rivers," which reduces water quality and adversely impacts riparian vegetation (NPS 1991).

Over 130 motorized vehicular river-access points exist on the ONSR, according to a 2007 analysis (Friends of the Ozark Riverways 2010). Virtually all gravel bars (used for canoe and boat camping) are accessed by all-terrain vehicles (ATVs) and other motorized vehicles (American Rivers 2011). ORV activity also increases erosion and sedimentation by exposing bare erodible soils in areas with frequent activity. ORVs frequently cross rivers inhabited by hellbenders and are driven in riverbeds where the water is shallow enough to enable this form of recreation. ORV use in the riverways could also directly impact hellbenders, as well as displace cover rocks (76 Fed. Reg. 61,967). Horseback riding near or in the riverways can also increase sedimentation and nutrient loads and reduce available dissolved oxygen, as explained in detail below.

The practice of removing large rocks and boulders to reduce damage to canoes is common on many hellbender streams (76 Fed. Reg. 61,967). The areas under these large rocks are important habitat for cover and nest sites; therefore, overturning or removing these rocks can diminish available cover and nest sites for hellbenders. The force delivered by a boat hitting a rock could easily injure or kill a hellbender, in addition to displacing or disrupting cover rocks (76 Fed. Reg. 61,967). Indeed, hellbenders encountered with gashes in their heads suggest that watercraft traffic likely impacts these animals (76 Fed. Reg. 61,966). The NPS has found that "increased use of jet boats has created a more constant level of disturbance to aquatic and riparian animals as well as physical disturbance to bank and bottom substrates" (Vana-Miller 2007).

#### Horseback Riding Near and in Rivers Causes Adverse Impacts to the Ozark Hellbender

Impacts of horseback riding on the ONSR must be considered in the context of other horseback riding that contributes nutrients or sediments to the Current River and its tributaries, including illegal horseback riding in the ONSR and horseback riding outside the ONSR. As explained below, pressure from horseback riding in and near streams inhabited by Ozark

hellbenders has increased substantially and may affect the amphibians by degrading the water quality of the riverways (76 Fed. Reg. at 61,967). It is also possible that horseback riding in the rivers may also directly harm or disturb hellbenders or their cover rocks.

#### Extent of Horseback Riding

Horseback riding in and near the ONSR is extensive. Currently, through an annually issued Supervisor's Compendium, NPS authorizes horseback riding by the public on unpaved state and county roads and four designated horse trails with designated river crossings. Within the ONSR, there are five designated river crossings on the Current River and two designated river crossings on Jacks Fork. The 2013 Supervisor's Compendium was approved on May 20, 2013, and is effective for one year. Supervisor's Compendium, [http://www.nps.gov/ozar/parkmgmt/zipload/LOZAR-SI/pt-Comp 051613 final-20 13 .pdf](http://www.nps.gov/ozar/parkmgmt/zipload/LOZAR-SI/pt-Comp%20051613%20final-2013.pdf) (last visited Sept. 27, 2013).

The four designated horse trails in the ONSR total approximately 23 miles (<http://www.nps.gov/ozar/planyourvisit/loader.cfm?csModule=security/getfile&PageID=164559>). Even just considering the four designated horse trails on the ONSR, there are several miles of trail where the proximity to the riverways would allow runoff of nutrients from horse waste or sedimentation through soil erosion.

Yet this only accounts for a fraction of miles of the available horseback riding routes because the NPS allows unlimited horse use of unpaved state and county roads. A 2000 analysis led by NPS found that within the 56-mile stretch of the Current from the upstream boundary to Goose Bay, there were 51 miles of horse trail running parallel to the river and on the flood plain, 83 percent of which were used exclusively for horse riding (Fenders 2011). There were nearly 30 miles of additional flood plain trail in other sections, in addition to numerous trails on higher ground (Fenders 2011). These trails include more than 80 places where horses cross the rivers and harm water quality with erosion and fecal coliform pollution (Fenders 2011). Moreover, when the water is low, many people use the river as a trail, riding along the river's edge.

In addition, the NPS authorizes commercial horseback riding operations through annual issuance of Commercial Use Authorizations ("CUAs"). For example, on July 26, 2012, the NPS authorized Trail Ride Guides LLC (aka Cross Country Trail Rides) to use the Two Rivers confluence area of ONSR from Jerktail to below Two Rivers and up the Jacks Fork to the Alley Mill area. This essentially amounts to the entire designated horse trail system on the ONSR. On November 2, 2012, Trail Ride Guides LLC reported that it served approximately 10,000 clients and took about 20 trips in the ONSR that year, utilizing three designated horse trails: Broadfoot Loop, Jerktail Loop, and Shawnee Loop. Although the Commercial Use Authorizations limit group size for guided rides to 25, it is not uncommon to observe groups with several dozens of horses on unpaved roads and trails near and on the ONSR.

To illustrate the demand for horseback riding in the area, consider that Trail Ride Guides LLC, which is located on the banks of Jacks Fork, boasts over 3000 horse stalls (<http://crosscountrytrailrides.com/general-info/>). At one study site on the Jacks Fork, observers documented up to 500 horses crossing per hour (Davis and Richards 2002).

A 1991 NPS study of roads and trails found that about 95 percent of horse use in the ONSR is attributable to the large organized multi-day trail rides, such as those held by Trail Ride Guides LLC (NPS 1991). That study suggested that the NPS consider restricting the total number of horse riders by utilizing a permit system (NPS 1991).

#### Impacts from Horseback Riding

The adverse impacts to the hellbender from horseback riding are caused primarily by erosion and sedimentation along the river and at river crossings, and manure being deposited into the river (76 Fed. Reg. at 61,966). Increased siltation may affect hellbenders in a variety of ways, such as suffocating eggs, eliminating suitable habitat for all life stages, reducing dissolved oxygen levels,

increasing contaminants (that bind to sediments), raising water temperatures, impeding movements, and reducing prey populations. (76 Fed. Reg. at 61,966-67).

Undoubtedly, sedimentation is a major threat to hellbenders (Quinn et al. 2013; Lawson 2012). Moreover, hellbenders require consistent levels of dissolved oxygen, which can be reduced when organic wastes like horse manure are deposited into waterways (76 Fed. Reg. at 61,957). Because hellbenders require high levels of water quality (e.g. Briggler et al. 2007), even minor alterations to stream habitat are likely to be detrimental to hellbender populations (76 Fed. Reg. at 61,964).

#### Erosion and Sedimentation

Horseback riding can lead to erosion and sedimentation when horses' hooves dig into the soil, especially when descending steep banks at river crossings. Impacts caused by horses generally occur to a much greater degree than other trail users because the large weight of the horse is transferred to the ground at the hooves, which are relatively sharp points that easily dig into and loosen soils (Wilson and Seney 1994; DeLuca et al. 1998; Newsome et al. 2004). The hooves loosen soil particles that are mobilized and transported into waterways (Newsome et al. 2004).

The movement of soils from the trails often results in trail proliferation and widening as users seek to avoid deeply incised or wet areas of trail. Prolonged sedimentation can eventually decrease the water depth and cause changes in the water flow and temperature, which also may affect hellbenders.

Widespread erosion problems may also undermine the soil-rooting zone of nearby vegetation, causing localized loss of individual plants and an extension of the erosion problem, as the protective function of plant cover continues to be lost (Newsome et al. 2004). The destruction of this vegetative cover can result in excessive solar heating of the water. Increased temperature regimes can affect oxygen levels in the waterways and affect respiration of aquatic animals.

#### Horse Wastes

Waste produced by horses ridden in and near waterways also affects Ozark hellbenders by increasing nutrient loads and reducing available dissolved oxygen. As a 2007 NPS report on water resources in the ONSR explains, "bodily wastes from animals is a major contamination threat to the park as well as a human health risk" (Vana-Miller 2007). "For example, increased levels of nitrates (that reach waterways as surface runoff or leachate from horse manure) can affect amphibians by inhibiting growth, decreasing survivability, and impairing their immune systems (76 Fed. Reg. 61,966-67). Fecal coliform bacteria are present in horse manure and are indicative of potential viruses and pathogens that cause swimmer-associated sickness in water bodies. Also, when horses walk in the river, they stir up sediment. Bacteria tied up in the sediments can be released whenever the streambed sediment is disturbed (Missouri Dept. of Natural Resources 2004; Marino and Gannon 1991). These water contaminants not only pose a threat directly to the Ozark Hellbender but also to the larger aquatic ecosystem and humans (see 76 Fed. Reg. 61,967).

There is evidence that horseback riding operations have degraded water quality in the ONSR (see, e.g., Emrie 1986; Vana-Miller 2007; Missouri Department of Natural Resources 2004). In 1998, a five-mile stretch of the Jacks Fork River from the town of Eminence to its confluence with the Current River was included on Missouri's list of impaired waters as required by Section 303(d) of the federal Clean Water Act. The identified pollutant on the Jacks Fork was fecal coliform bacteria, whose presence in large numbers indicated contamination by fecal wastes of warm-blooded animals (Davis and Richards 2001). The length of the impaired reach was increased to seven miles in 2002 because of data indicating the fecal coliform bacteria problem existed over a broader area (Davis and Barr 2006). From 2003 to 2008 the Missouri Department of Natural Resources again expanded the impaired stretch of the Jacks Fork, to eight

miles (76 Fed. Reg. at 61,966). In 2002 at river mile 4.5 the annual coliform geometric mean was 26, and in 2009 it was 116 (Friends of the Ozark Riverways 2010).

The USGS conducted a three-phase study to better understand the extent and sources of microbiological contamination in the impaired reach. Davis and Richards (2001) found fecal coliform densities were generally larger in that reach and that the standard was exceeded at some sites. Data from Phase II (Davis and Richards 2002) indicated that, after accounting for wetweather flow, the largest densities were during horse trail rides - this occurred in both water and streambed sediment samples. That study did not positively identify sources of contaminants but runoff from a commercial horse trail ride outfitter and horse stream crossings were identified as likely sources (76 Fed. Reg. at 61,966, citing Davis and Richards 2002, pp. 1,3, and 36).

Phase III (Davis and Barr 2006) was an attempt to determine the causes and sources. The scientists found that increases in fecal coliform bacteria densities in the Jacks Fork are associated with cross-country horseback trail-riding events (Davis and Barr 2006). A total of 501 fecal coliform bacteria isolates were analyzed via a methodology that identifies presumptive sources of fecal bacteria in the Jacks Fork River -70 isolates were from sewage, 132 to horses, 118 to cattle, and 181 unknown. In short, recreational users (including boaters and swimmers) are not the primary source of fecal coliform bacteria in the Jacks Fork; rather, the presence of fecal coliform bacteria is associated with other animals, of which horses are the primary sources (Davis and Barr 2006).

#### Analysis of Alternatives

The "No Action" alternative is a description of current park management to serve as a baseline for comparison. existing conditions include expanding presence of motorized vehicles, explosive growth of equestrian use, proliferation of un designated trails and river access, overcrowding resulting in conflicts among user groups, and inadequate monitoring and enforcement of existing regulations. This alternative is unacceptable because it would result in further degradation of natural resources and the visitor experience.

Each of the action alternatives would provide some important benefits over the existing conditions. In particular, all of the action alternatives include: engaging in ecological restoration projects, such as closure of some undesigned roads, trails, and river access points; increasing law enforcement for compliance; maintaining Big Spring's primitive character; providing for non-motorized zones; preparing a recreational horse use and trail management plan; and establishing a permitting system, as necessary, to manage impacts of horse use. We are extremely supportive of these proposals. In particular, increases in law enforcement for compliance is important to stop illegal ORV activity, which increases erosion and sedimentation as explained above. Also, creation of non-motorized zones would result in less disturbance to the aquatic environment and would likely benefit the hellbender.

Yet the action alternatives vary in the extent to which they emphasize protection of natural resources. The NPS identified Alternative A as the environmentally preferred alternative, and the Center encourages the NPS to adopt Alternative A for the reasons explained below. Alternative A is More Protective of Water Quality than the NPS's Preferred Alternative B. Because undesigned roads and trails can contribute to water quality degradation through erosion and sedimentation, we support the NPS's proposals to close undesigned and illegal routes. Alternative A would restore 50 miles of such routes and Alternative B would restore 45 miles. In addition, Alternative A would replace 15 miles of un designated roads with hiking trails and Alternative B would replace 10 miles. Although both of these alternatives are a big improvement over the existing condition, Alternative A is more aggressive at addressing illegal and undesigned routes and should be adopted.

Equestrian overuse is a significant threat to water quality and the Ozark hellbender. As such, the Center is very pleased that all action alternatives will establish a permitting system, as necessary, to manage impacts of horse use. We believe that current impacts from horses,

including river closures due to high bacteria levels, show that such a permitting system is absolutely necessary. Unlike Alternative B and Alternative C, Alternative A would not allow horse camping. We are extremely concerned that a large developed horse campground along Jacks Fork would have adverse impacts to water quality. We believe that adequate opportunities for horse camping already exist outside of the ONSR. In addition, a horse campground would attract additional use of the horse trail system, which is already strained from overuse.

Although we are pleased that all action alternatives would close and restore 65 miles of unauthorized horse trails and river crossings, all action alternatives would significantly expand the designated horse trail system, with Alternative A adding 25 miles and Alternative B adding 35 miles with new stream crossings. The NPS must use great caution when planning any additional stream crossings to ensure no adverse impacts to the hellbender. Plus, we strongly believe that such an expansion of the horse trail system cannot occur unless the impacts are fully analyzed, and we support preparing a recreational horse use and trail management plan under all action alternatives. In addition, the NPS must consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under the Endangered Species Act on how such horse management would impact the Ozark hellbender.

#### Suggested Changes to Action Alternatives

To reduce erosion and sedimentation, the NPS should emphasize restoring and stabilizing the riparian corridor. There should be no new conversions of bottomland riparian forests to open fields, and impaired and eroded riverbanks should be restored with native vegetation.

We appreciate that Alternative A prohibits motorized access to gravel bars, which could help reduce problems of erosion and aquatic disturbance at these sites. Under Alternative B, the NPS would designate which gravel bars are accessible by motor vehicle. If that alternative is selected, the NPS should be sure to locate these sites away from areas occupied by Ozark hellbenders. In addition, any new developed facilities along rivers should be considered only after analyzing impacts on water quality and Ozark hellbenders.

Some of the impacts to Ozark hellbenders are the result of unintentional but harmful human activities that could be modified with public education. For example, some canoeists move boulders to avoid collisions without realizing that they are destroying potential hellbender habitat. And some anglers kill hellbenders based on myths that they are poisonous and damage the sport fishery. We recommend that the NPS promote public education about the importance of hellbenders with various forms of outreach, such as signs and displays.

We are very concerned that the NPS lacks the funding and personnel to implement the expanded recreational use and new developments that are proposed under Alternatives B and C. The ONSR has seen a 30 percent reduction in staff in the last decade due to funding decreases, and NPS should hesitate to make changes to park management that would require increases in staff to monitor resources and provide enforcement to respond to increases in use.

We understand that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will be preparing an Endangered Species Act Section 7 biological opinion on the effects of the GMP on endangered wildlife within the ONSR, including the Ozark hellbender, Indiana bat, and gray bat. We are pleased that the NPS is consulting with the Service and recommend that the NPS adopt any mitigation measures recommended during consultation.

\*\*\*

For the above stated reasons, the Center recommends that NPS adopt Alternative A, which is the environmentally preferred alternative. We support the NPS's commitment to dealing with the serious problems from overuse that have developed on the ONSR. If you have any questions or would like to discuss these comments, please contact me.

Sincerely,  
Collette L. Adkins Giese

Trisha Crabill  
Eric Daniels

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2982    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Re: Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan, Wilderness Study & Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Superintendent Black:

Great Rivers Environmental Law Center ("Great Rivers") submits these comments on behalf of Mrs. Edward ("Pat") Jones on the National Park Service's Draft General Management Plan, Wilderness Study and Environmental Impact Statement ("Management Plan"). Pat Jones has enjoyed the Ozark National Scenic Riverways ("ONSR") for more than 80 years, and urges the National Park Service to manage the ONSR so that as many people as possible can have good experiences spread out over as long a period of time as possible. Pat and her husband, Ted Jones (now deceased) spent many weekends and summers enjoying the Ozark Rivers and Pat believes the Ozark Rivers are a great part of Missouri and will remain that if we properly care for them.

#### Introduction

The National Park Service ("NPS") seeks public comment on its Draft General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement, a document presenting four alternative management plans for the ONSR. The NPS hopes "the approved general management plan will provide comprehensive guidance for perpetuating natural systems, preserving cultural resources, and providing opportunities for quality visitor experiences at ONSR for the next 15 or 20 years.<sup>1</sup>

Congress created the ONSR "for the purpose of conserving and interpreting unique scenic and other natural values and objects of historic interest, including preservation of portions of the Current River and the Jacks Fork River in Missouri as free-flowing streams, preservation of springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources thereof by the people of the United States.<sup>2</sup> Alternative A best fulfills legislative intent regarding the ONSR. Specifically, the NPS should select Alternative A as the ONSR management plan for the following reasons:

1. Excessive equestrian use in the ONSR has increased bank erosion, increased stream sedimentation, reduced habitat quality and increased potentially unsafe bacteria levels. Alternative A will do the most to restore damage due to excessive equestrian use and to prevent further damage from excessive equestrian use.
2. Excessive All Terrain Vehicle ("ATV") use in the ONSR has caused increased bank erosion, increased stream sedimentation, reduced habitat quality and created numerous undesignated trails and river crossings. Alternative A will do the most to restore damage due to excessive ATV use and to prevent further damage from excessive ATV use.
3. Development and continued use of unauthorized roads in the ONSR have caused increased bank erosion, increased stream sedimentation, reduced habitat quality and created numerous undesignated trails and river crossings. The habitat for the federally endangered Ozark Hellbender has been reduced, leading to a 75% decline of the species since the 1980's. Alternative A falls short of taking the aggressive steps necessary to ensure the long-term survival of rare aquatic species like the endangered Ozark Hellbender and should be strengthened, but it will do the most of the proposals to restore damage due to the development and continued use of unauthorized roads and to prevent further damage from the development and continued use of unauthorized roads.
4. Excessive development and continued use of authorized roads in the ONSR have caused increased bank erosion, increased stream sedimentation, reduced habitat quality and created numerous undesignated trails and river crossings. Alternative A will do the most to restore damage due to the excessive development and continued use of authorized roads and to prevent further damage from the excessive development and continued use of authorized roads.



5. Gravel mining operations adversely affect adjacent tributaries and the ONSR by altering flow patterns, changing channel structure, relocating channels, and causing bank erosion. This in turn reduces the habitat quality within the ONSR. Alternative A will do the most to restore damage due to gravel mining operations and to prevent further damage from gravel mining operations.

6. Climate change threatens to affect the hydrology of the ONSR in dramatic and unpredictable ways. Alternative A offers the best chance of mitigating damage to terrestrial and aquatic habitats.

In addition, Mrs. Jones requests the NPS to add these items to its Plan:

1. The NPS should set a limit on the number of people allowed on the rivers in the same places at the same time to a smaller number. This could be done by either or both of the following: a) requiring people to obtain permits (they can be free) from the NPS before allowing them on the rivers; and/or

b) requiring the canoe and raft rental places to limit the number of people "put-in" at each place to a manageable number. Currently, there are times on weekends the rivers are jammed with rafts and canoes blocking the rivers so completely that other people cannot find space to pass by the jammed boats.

2. The NPS should require every group floating to carry a camping toilet as they do in other national parks, and to take their wastes out with them. At times the gravel bars smell foul and toilet paper is visible on them. This should be stopped. Other National Parks have better requirements; the NPS should manage the ONSR more restrictively so that it looks clean.

#### Analysis

1. Excessive equestrian use in the ONSR has caused increased bank erosion, increased stream sedimentation, reduced habitat quality and increased potentially unsafe bacteria levels. Alternative A will do the most to restore damage due to excessive equestrian use and to prevent further damage from excessive equestrian use. No additional equestrian trails should be added in the ONSR. Additional trails are contrary to the ONSR's purpose of preserving the natural values of the area. The area is already serviced by a "large commercial, cross-country horseback trail riding facility"<sup>3</sup> Therefore, Pat Jones and Great Rivers urge the NPS to consider removing the addition of equestrian trails from Alternative A. However, Alternative A falls short of taking the aggressive steps necessary to ensure the long-term survival of rare aquatic species like the endangered Ozark Hellbender. If the NPS declines to do this, Great Rivers and Mrs. Jones still support Alternative A as the plan that will allow the least amount of harm to ONSR due to equestrian activities.

Both Alternatives A and B (the NPS's preferred alternative) will provide for the addition of approximately 25 miles of trails designated for equestrian use. Under Alternative B, some new stream crossings will be included in this trail network but under Alternative A, no new stream crossings will be added. Because these stream crossings increase bank erosion, increase harmful sedimentation, and reduce habitat quality, they frustrate the ONSR's purpose of conserving unique scenic and natural values, preserving the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, managing wildlife and providing for enjoyment of outdoor recreation opportunities.

Additionally, horse manure contains bacteria, including E. coli and Salmonella.<sup>4</sup> While probably not harmful in small amounts, high concentrations could potentially be dangerous to people and wildlife, especially in waterways used for boating, fishing and swimming. By not including any additional stream crossings designated for equestrian use, Alternative A best ensures that the waterways within the ONSR will be protected from harmful bacterial contamination due to horse manure. Therefore, Alternative A provides the best option for successfully managing equestrian use within the ONSR.

2. Excessive All Terrain Vehicle ("ATV") use in the ONSR has caused increased bank erosion, increased stream sedimentation, reduced habitat quality and created numerous undesignated trails and river crossings. Alternative A will do the most to restore damage due to excessive ATV use and to prevent further damage from excessive ATV use.

Alternative A best fulfills legislative intent regarding ATV recreation management within the ONSR. First,

Alternative A will decommission approximately 15 miles of roads in primitive zones and replace them with trails. As motor vehicle uses are not compatible with primitive uses, it is essential that the NPS remove these roads and ATV access be prohibited. Second, Alternative A will prohibit all vehicular access to gravel bars. Gravel bars are sensitive areas and are extremely susceptible to erosion, sedimentation and reduced habitat quality. Overall, Alternative A will restore approximately 50 miles of roads to natural conditions. These management changes are essential to fulfilling the NPS' purpose of conserving unique scenic and other natural values, preserving the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, managing wildlife and providing for enjoyment of outdoor recreation opportunities.

3. Development and continued use of unauthorized roads have caused increased bank erosion, increased stream sedimentation, reduced habitat quality, especially for the federally endangered Ozark Hellbender, and numerous undesignated trails and river crossings. Alternative A will do the most to restore damage done to the ONSR due to the development and continued use of unauthorized roads and to prevent further damage from the development and continued use of unauthorized roads. Although all of the proposed alternatives (except the No-Action Alternative) provide for the closure of all unauthorized roads, the NPS can best prevent future development of such roads by selecting Alternative A. Alternative A will prohibit all vehicular access to gravel bars. Gravel bars are sensitive areas and are extremely susceptible to erosion, sedimentation, and reduced habitat quality. Alternative A will also restore approximately 50 miles of roads to natural conditions. By decommissioning these unnecessary roads and prohibiting vehicle access to gravel bars, the NPS will discourage the future development of unauthorized roads because access to many areas will be limited exclusively to watercraft or foot traffic. The habitat for the federally endangered Ozark Hellbender has been reduced, leading to a 75% decline of the species since the 1980's.

Alternative A falls short of taking the aggressive steps necessary to ensure the long-term survival of rare aquatic species like the endangered Ozark Hellbender and should be strengthened. These management changes are essential to fulfilling ONSR's purpose of conserving unique scenic and other natural values, preserving the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, managing wildlife and providing for enjoyment of outdoor recreation opportunities.

4. Excessive development and continued use of authorized roads in the ONSR have caused increased bank erosion, increased stream sedimentation, reduced habitat quality and created numerous undesignated trails and river crossings. Alternative A will do the most to restore damage due to the excessive development and continued use of authorized roads and to prevent further damage from the excessive development and continued use of authorized roads.

Alternative A best fulfills legislative intent regarding road management within the ONSR. Alternative A will prohibit all vehicle access to gravel bars. Gravel bars are sensitive areas and are extremely susceptible to erosion, sedimentation, and reduced habitat quality. By prohibiting vehicle access to gravel bars the NPS can both ensure their preservation and emphasize traditional, family-oriented recreation like gravel bar camping. Alternative A will also remove all roads to primitive sites. As motor vehicle uses are not compatible with primitive uses, it is essential that the NPS remove these roads. Additionally, Alternative A will restore approximately 50 miles of roads to natural conditions, restoring and de-segmenting wildlife habitat. By decommissioning these unnecessary roads, prohibiting access to gravel bars and removing road access to primitive sites, Alternative A best fulfills the ONSR's purpose of conserving unique scenic and other natural values, preserving the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, managing wildlife and providing for enjoyment of outdoor recreation opportunities.

5. Gravel mining operations adversely affect adjacent tributaries and the ONSR by altering flow patterns, changing channel structure, relocating channels, and causing bank erosion. This in turn reduces the habitat quality within the ONSR. Alternative A will do the most to restore damage done to the ONSR due to gravel mining operations and to prevent further damage from gravel mining operations. The NPS has determined that gravel mining on adjacent land can adversely impact the geologic, water and wildlife resources of ONSR. 5 Alternative A provides the ONSR with the best protection against these potential impacts. By closing roads, removing river crossings and prohibiting vehicle access to gravel bars, Alternative A best protects the resources within the unit and therefore will result in the least cumulative damage to them. In fact, the NPS has determined that "Alternative A would contribute an appreciable, long-term, beneficial increment to the cumulative effect" on geologic, water and wildlife resources, while the benefits of Alternatives B and C are characterized as "small" or "small to appreciable." 6 These benefits will help restore habitat quality and mitigate damage from adjacent gravel mining; therefore Alternative A best fulfills the ONSR's purpose of conserving unique scenic and other natural values, preserving the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, managing wildlife and providing for enjoyment of outdoor recreation opportunities.

6. Climate change threatens to affect the hydrology of the ONSR in dramatic and unpredictable ways. Alternative A

offers the best chance of mitigating damage to terrestrial and aquatic habitats.

The effects climate change will have on the Ozark region are not fully understood.<sup>7</sup> That is precisely why the NPS should exercise caution and select Alternative A, the least environmentally harmful alternative, as it prepares to manage the ONSR through climate change in the coming decades. Possible conditions range from an 80% increase in peak flood flow if climate change brings wetter conditions to the region, to a 41 % decrease in minimum flow in dry conditions.<sup>8</sup> Regardless of where the ONSR's actual climate falls on this spectrum, the NPS supported study "suggest[s] that streamflow changes resulting from the landcover change and climate change could cause significant changes of the basin's surface hydrology and, thus, the aquatic as well as terrestrial habitats in the basin."<sup>9</sup>

All of the aforementioned reasons have intrinsic merit and are reason enough for the NPS to select Alternative A. With the cumulative beneficial impact Alternative A offers in light of impending climate change, it becomes clear that the NPS must select Alternative A. By prohibiting new equestrian stream crossings Alternative A best protects the streams from erosion, sedimentation and microbial contamination. By decommissioning roads and restricting ATV access Alternative A best protects and restores the terrestrial and aquatic habitats of the ONSR. All of these measures help ensure the ONSR has a healthy, dynamic ecosystem which will be best able to withstand the effects of climate change.

Great Rivers reserves the right to rely on all public comments submitted, requests a written response to comments, and requests written notification of any action taken on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan, Wilderness Study & Environmental Impact Statement.

#### Conclusion

As the first Scenic Waterway in the nation, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is an invaluable resource for the citizens of Missouri and all Americans. It is therefore imperative that the NPS take all precautions necessary to ensure that this fragile, unique environment maintain the characteristics that inspired Congress to reserve it over 50 years ago. By regulating equestrian and ATV recreation more stringently, removing and discouraging unauthorized roads, eliminating unnecessary and intrusive authorized roads, and protecting against damage from adjacent gravel mining operations, Alternative A will best allow the NPS to fulfill the purpose of the ONSR as outlined in the enabling legislation. For these reasons Pat Jones and Great Rivers urge the NPS to implement Alternative A of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan, Wilderness Study & Environmental Impact Statement.

Very truly yours,  
Mrs. Edward (Pat) Jones  
Brett Korte  
Intern, Great Rivers Environmental Law Center  
Kathleen Henry  
President, Great Rivers Environmental Law Center

1 ONSR GMP title page.

2 Pub. L. 88-492, 2, Aug. 27, 1964, 78 Stat. 608

3 Davis, J.V. & J.M. Richard. Assessment of possible sources of microbiological contamination and water-quality characteristics of the Jacks Fork, Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Missouri - Phase II. U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 02-4209.(2002), at 1. Available at <http://water.usgs.gov/npspartnership/ozar.php>.

4 See <http://www.cdc.gov/healthypets/animals/horse.htm> and <http://www.cdc.gov/ecoli/index.html>.

5 See ONSR GMP at 241,253-254.

6 See ONSR GMP at 242-296.

7 Hu, Willson, Chen & Akyuz, Effects of Climate & Landcover Change on Stream Discharge in the Ozark Highlands, USA.(2005,) at 9. Available at <http://www.researchgate.net/publication/1227064501> Effects of climate and landcover change on stream discharge \_in The Ozark Highlands USA. If Id. at 18.

9 Id.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2983    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Re: OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN I WILDERNESS STUDY I ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Dear Mr. Black:

The Department of Conservation (Department) appreciates this opportunity to submit comments on the National Park Service's Ozark National Scenic Riverways (Scenic Riverways) draft General Management Plan / Wilderness Study / Environmental Impact Statement (GMP).

The Department's mission is to protect and manage the forest, fish, and wildlife resources in the state; and to facilitate and provide opportunity for all citizens to use, enjoy and learn about these resources. In addition, the Department is responsible for managing significant acres for Missourians adjacent to the Scenic Riverways.

Based on our review of the draft GMP, the Department offers the following comments:

1. Many aspects of the existing 1984 GMP are not being implemented/enforced by the National Park Service (NPS), such as undesignated trails and roads. The Department opposes options presented in the newly prepared draft GMP, while supporting implementation/enforcement of the existing 1984 plan.
2. The Department requests the NPS to organize a working group that includes local community members, resource agencies, and other interest groups to develop new management approaches that resolve unauthorized access/use issues within the Scenic Riverways. The GMP states that "undesignated trails and crossings are not designed to withstand the use they receive or control potential impacts to natural resources. Typically, undesignated trails and crossings are susceptible to erosion and a loss of vegetation, which can lead to impacts on wildlife habitat, hydrologic processes, and water quality, including increased turbidity." The NPS must work to ensure access points are safe and accessible for both public and commercial users.
3. The Department opposes the recommendation to designate 3,430 acres of the Big Spring unit as "Wilderness" under the Wilderness Act of 1964. The area under consideration for the wilderness designation includes the Big Spring Pines Natural Area and is also part of the Department's Current River Hills Conservation Opportunity Area. The wilderness designation is a concern for continued management of the pine-oak woodlands because this community type requires periodic fires and natural disturbance. The wilderness designation usually precludes the use of chainsaws, leaf blowers, ATVs/UTVs, and air operations, which are critical for safe prescribed fire operations. Limiting prescribed fire crews to hand tools would hinder efforts to restore and maintain the area's pine-oak woodlands. The wilderness designation would also constrain standard operating procedures for wildfire suppression, creating safety concerns for firefighters and risks for adjacent lands.
4. Proposed year-round changes to horsepower restrictions or the designation of nonmotorized zones are not supported by the Department. Zoning based on horsepower limits access in some areas of the river. Restriction of motorboats would impact the Department's ability to manage fish populations, assist with required public safety and rescue activities, and enforce the Wildlife Code within the Scenic Riverways.
5. The Department requests that the NPS continue to allow hunting, fishing, and

trapping throughout the Scenic Riverways. Department staff look forward to continuing the trout management program administered by the Department on the upper reaches of the Current River and continuing to provide management of fisheries and wildlife resources throughout the Scenic Riverways.

These comments are intended to help the National Park Service develop a GMP that will provide sustainable and resilient habitats for future generations to enjoy. Mr. Alan Leary is available at (573) 522-4115, extension 3346 or email [atalan.learv@mdc.mo.gov](mailto:atalan.learv@mdc.mo.gov) as a point of contact for additional discussion on these comments.

Thank you for this opportunity to review and provide comments on the draft GMP.

Sincerely,  
Robert L. Ziehmer  
Director

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2984	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,01,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Re: Revision to the General Management Plan for Ozark Scenic National Riverways.				

The following comments are based on the proposed plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. In the thirty years since the last management plan the US population has increased placing additional stress on the usage of the ONSR. The choice of "no change" is simply to stick one's head in the sand and ignore reality. This simply does a disservice to the ONSR and the American public. Change is scary for some but it is needed because of population increases and changes in recreational usage patterns of the American public. My comments are restricted to areas of concern to me.

1. ATV Usage. Simply put ATV type vehicles have no place on the ONSR. The ONSR, like a large portion of the Ozark's, consist of highly desiccated ridge tops surrounding the deep valleys of the two rivers. The topsoil is marginal at best and highly at risk for erosion. The U.S. Forest Service bans the use of ATV's off of authorized roads in the Mark Twain National Forest, which comprises a lot of flatter land then the steep terrain of the ONSR. The Forest Service provides for off road ATV usage at several locations, Sutton Bluff etc., but even there usage is restricted to laid out and approved trails. Because of the terrain in the ONSR the use of ATV type vehicles, due to their propensity to seek challenging terrain to ride roughshod over, should not be allowed. The issue of ATV usage was not addressed in the old management plan simply because thirty years ago ATV's essentially did not exist and it was not an issue.

2. Horse Usage: I own and ride horses. However my "right" to ride my horse cannot justifiably prevent others from enjoying the ONSR. With a number of competing user groups wanting access to the ONSR the effect of the different activities on the other uses must be considered. Simply put no one should expect that their pleasure should be allowed unfettered and without consideration of other usage groups. If one or two horses defecate in the river at a crossing the manure will be disposed of by natural biological processes. However several hundred horses defecating at one location at the same time presents a problem. No one wants the presence of E. Coli in the rivers of such a magnitude that it becomes a health issue. Yes, I am aware that deer may poop in the river but natural biological processes break down the distributed manure from a smaller animal than a horse. These same processes will eliminate distributed horse manure but it is the concentration and quantity of manure that may pose a problem. Since a river crossing offers the horse an opportunity to drink, the time spent in the river is increased and thus the opportunity for manure to be deposited in the river. Since the reduction of "horse apples" floating in the river adjacent to people floating in tubes is desired, consideration of a way to reduce horse exposure time in the river might be of use. For example the availability of watering troughs placed back from the river would serve two purposes. One would be the reduction of manure being deposited in the river and secondly allow managed use of manure as a resource. The water tanks might be arranged such that gravity feed from the river might be possible or a small solar powered pump might be used to provide water to the tanks adjacent to river crossings.

The manure could be useful as a soil conditioner for help in restoration of damaged soil areas. Horse manure is an

excellent organic soil conditioner and fertilizer to restore the thin topsoil. Or more creative uses such as selling manure in plastic bags with labels such as "Found something at the ONSR that reminder me of you" at the Visitors Centers. I think it was H.L. Meneken who said, "No one ever went broke underestimating the intelligent of the American public."

The great naturalist John Muhr, beloved of the Sierra Club, did not explore and write about what would become Yosemite National Park on his own. His companion on these ventures was Brownie, a mustang horse. Muhr did not walk around Yosemite but in fact rode his horse. Horse usage in park areas has a long history and predates a number of parks. There are historic and economic reasons for continued horse enjoyment in the ONSR. Management of horse trails to enhance the enjoyment of riders while reducing conflict between users is desierable. The visual experience I get from riding the rim overlooking the rivers compares favorably with other trails I have ridden such as the Pacific Crest Trail, the historic Western States trail to the California gold fields and trails in the Smoky Mountains of Virginia. The ONSR is a local treasure to be cherished, but must be available for usage by multiple usage groups.

3. ROAD ACCESS: From talking to a number of people the issue of closing roads seems to be the "They want to take away my access to \_\_\_ (fill in the blank) that my Grandpappy used when he took me fishing when I was a little boy." The comment being made from a grizzled retired person. The problem is that there are a lot more popel using the river then when "Grandpappy" took a kid fishing thirty or forty years ago. I am old enough to remember when there was no traffic light in Salem. Now they're several and also one way streets, why? because there are more cars on the roads. Increased uncontrolled usage is not a desirable management plan. However the question that must be considered is, does the road cause a problem to the park. If not, then why close it to the public. Perhaps by upgrading the facilities at certain key road access points the public would be better accommodated then with continued usage of marginal roads that present a problem to the park. The issue seems to not be the one "local" who uses an old road for access but the 50 or 60 "non-locals" who follow in his tracks. The "local" may consider him or herself to be a steward of the land but the 50 or 60 "non-locals" who follow in their tracks may not have the same historic reverence for the land. As pointed out above the elimination of off road ATV type equipment may lessen the adverse impact of access everywhere and whenever mentally that seems to prevail among some visitors to the ONSR.

4. Management Issues. In graduate school I had a management professor that spent his early career in private industry and I still remember one of his admonishments. It was to avoid large scale sweeping management changes like the plague. When you gore everyone's ox at once everyone's against your changes and makes common cause against you. Unfortunately the General Management Plan has placed the ONSR in the position of having ALL the peasants besieging the castle with torches and pitchforks at the same time. Note that the term "peasant" is used only in the allegorical sense and is NOT meant in a literal sense. Yours is a difficult task and I do not envy your position. The best of luck to you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2985	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,08,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	REGARDS: Two Major Comments Concerning Ozark Scenic Riverways General Plan				

#### Alternatives

The National Park Service will find during the comments period that there will be overwhelming opposition to their preferred alternative plan that drastically restricts access of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to the Missourians who depend on the area for their socio-economic existence. However, after reading the National Park Service's General Plan, it was apparent that the National Park Service planners ignored two essential areas that make the entire General Plan unacceptable to review.

(1) The first area was the National Park Service's statutory dllty to comply with the Federal Law which created the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The Secretary of Interior has failed to meet the requirements of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Act of 1963, by not cooperating with the State of Missouri and its political subdivisions in formulating

comprehensive plans for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The result of this failure has allowed the National Park Service to produce three General Management Plans (A, Band C), that were developed by their Denver, Colorado based planning employees and a large number of consultants; of which, none represented the State of Missouri and their political subdivisions.

16 U.S.C.

United States Code, 2011 Edition

Title 16 - CONSERVATION

CHAPTER 1 - NATIONAL PARKS, MILITARY PARKS, MONUMENTS, AND SEASHORES

SUBCHAPTER LXX - OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS

From the U.S. Government Printing Office, [www.gpo.gov](http://www.gpo.gov)

§460m-4. Cooperative land development programs; hunting and fishing

(a) Development of comprehensive plans

In furtherance of the purposes of this subchapter, the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the State of Missouri, its political subdivisions, and other Federal agencies and organizations in formulating comprehensive plans for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and for the related watershed of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers in Missouri, and to enter into agreements for the implementation of such plans. Such plans may provide for land use and development programs, for preservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the landscape, and for conservation of outdoor resources in the watersheds of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers.

¶ Consultation and Coordination with the State of Missouri amounted to the following:

On November 15, 2010, park staff met with representatives of the Missouri State Historic Preservation Office and the Missouri Attorney General's Office. At that meeting, the park staff explained the general management planning and wilderness study process and the current phase of the plan. The state historic preservation officer was provided a copy of the Newsletter 3 (spring/ summer 2009) and was informed of the preliminary alternatives that had been developed. The National Riverways would keep the state historic preservation officer informed as general management planning progresses. (Pg. 383)

(2) The second area was the omission by the National Park Service, within the Alternative Plans, of the actual devastating effect on this area of Missouri if portions of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways become Wilderness Areas or if the National Park Service is given the authority to "prepare" the areas after Wilderness designation. Within the National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan / Wilderness Study / Environmental Impact Statement; the National Park Service admits that the General Alternative Plans are "based on research and the professional judgment of planners who have experience with similar projects. In terms of geographic scope, the impact analyses in this section primarily focus on the socioeconomic conditions of the local communities (primarily Eminence and Van Buren), and the two adjacent counties (Carter and Shannon counties) because this is where most impacts would be most noticeable."

A perfect comparative example of the public's actual interest in a "Wilderness Area" is the 16,000 acres of Irish Wilderness that is located only 20 miles southwest of Van Buren. The Irish Wilderness has a similar topography as the Ozark National Scenic Riverways area and also contains the Eleven Point National Wild and Scenic River. The visitor use of this area is estimated by the United States Forest Service as being 500 - 700 visits on average each year. Rather than promote a logical comparative study in the proposed Alternative Plans with the Irish Wilderness, the National Park Service totally ignored this huge underutilized area that was formed by the federal government in 1984. Such an omission by the National Park Service is incompetence at best; or at worst, a dishonest cover up of the true SocioEconomic consequences of their preferred alternative plans.

CONCLUSION: The only legal Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Plan is the "NO ACTION PLAN"

We the undersigned Support this Comment Letter that identifies:

1. The Secretary of Interior has failed to meet the requirements of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Act of 1963, by not cooperating with the State of Missouri and its political subdivisions in formulating comprehensive plans for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.
2. The National Park Service omission, within the Alternative Plans, of the actual devastating social and economic effect on this area of Missouri, if portions of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways become Wilderness Areas.
3. Support of the "WO ACTION PLAN"

Richard Joyner

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2986	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,20,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	January 20, 2014				

Superintendent  
Ozark National Scenic Riverways  
PO Box 490  
Van Buren, MO 63965

REGARDS: Support of "No Action Alternative General Plan"

Superintendent:

When I was a young boy, my grandfather, Frank Roberts, owned 200 acres at the mouth of Rocky Creek on Current River. The National Park Service took the farm by eminent domain in the 60's. The NPS told my grandfather they were going to make the river a place where all people can always enjoy it. Unfortunately, that seems to no longer be the goal of the park service.

Through the years I have seen the changes that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways have made. They have made it where families can enjoy it for a day or a lifetime. There is access all up and down the river and room for everyone to enjoy it. If they want to canoe, tube, run a boat, go hiking, hunting, or fishing, or just enjoy the scenery and the beauty of the nature they can. Now, the ONSR is forgetting the purpose of our tax dollars spent. It is not for the special groups or lobbyist with money. It is for the enjoyment of all people.

I have spoken with the Department of Natural Resources and there is no study showing the riverways being misused or in a state of digression. The locals are very proud of their rivers and do many projects each year to keep the rivers clean, including a yearly clean out. Most trash and misuse comes from those coming into the park and not being educated on how our river systems work and how we operate as a community to keep them clean and cared for. We need to find a way to educate them about our river systems and the amazing ways this river system provides for our communities, and that we want to share our awesome rivers and parks with all.

So Mr. Superintendent, I am asking you and the committee to leave the river as it is, "No Action".

As for the wilderness area suggested for the now Big Springs area. We have an Irish Wilderness area of several thousands of acres just a few miles from here. This Irish Wilderness Area sees 400 to 700 visitors a year. This is as many visitors that Big Springs now accommodates in one day during peak season. So why the change if we are wanting to make this for the people? Can you give me a reason? Once again I state, "No Action".

Sincerely,

Rickie L Roberts  
Mountain View, MO 65548



---

**Correspondence ID:** 2987    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I CAN HEAR CURRENT RIVER CRY

Growing up on the Current River where the river ran through my back yard at Akers, MO makes me feel very, very fortunate to have had the opportunity to grow up in such a beautiful area and has left me with wonderful memories. The river is where I go to meditate and enjoy God's beautiful creation of nature and the beauty around it and celebrate the happiest and heal the saddest moments of my life. I absolutely enjoy swimming, canoeing, kayaking, inner. tubing or just sitting in the river. I feel deprived if I don't get enough of it. I have always cried in the river when I have been terribly frustrated or devastated at whatever has occurred in my life (the loss of a loved one or some other disappointment in my life.) The river has a healing and energizing effect on me.

My love for the river and land at Akers runs very deep. The land had been passed down through my family for generations since the Civil War in my mother's family (Loreen Purcell Maggard.) Akers was the trade center for the community for miles around. Members of the Purcell family lived up and down the river from Akers. Beanie Purcell lived down the river across from Cave Springs. They farmed, trapped, fished, logged, and raised hogs and cattle to make a living. My grandfather, George C. Purcell owned the country store (on the hill above the Junction K and KK.) He owned seven sawmills and much of the land surrounding Akers. Some family members were even moonshiners. They also ran the ferryboat. Members of his family (Frank Purcell, Marion Purcell, George Purcell and finally my mother, Loreen), were the postmasters at the Akers Post Office which was inside their country store. The country store met the needs of all the community. Shoppers could shop for food, dry goods and even get a haircut. It had a potbellied stove so many hours were spent socializing and telling hunting stories and whatever was on one's mind at the time. The upstairs of the store housed the Oddfellow's Lodge. They had an initiation chair that they would have the fellow sit on and the legs would collapse. I have fond memories of tricking my friends with that chair (The lodge had disbanded before I was born.) The telephone office was there also. A member of the family had to be stationed at the phone and connect all the neighbors who received calls.

Mt. Zion Church sat at the top of the hill above Akers. The land where the church house sits was donated by my grandparents and built by the community. My father was very proud of his part in building the church. I remember riding horseback in front of Robert Crosswhite to church on most Sundays while Mt. Zion Church was operating. My family attended many baptisms at the river below the ferryboat. Revivals, singings, community dinners and gatherings were held at Mt. Zion. It is a beautiful rock building. After the park service took over, they gave everything away that was in the building and wanted to tear it down. The Missouri State Historical Society got involved with the community members and thank God the building was saved. It is sitting there empty when it could be used as an inspiration point, museum, and be used for community events. I would like to see it restored to its original state. Rev. Yount and later Rev. Wobus preached there.

The Akers School sat on the east side of Gladden Valley Creek. In her early years, my mother taught there. My sister, Omaleta, had her for a teacher. Unfortunately, the park service tore the school building down years ago. I spent many hours playing in that building. Mom also taught for a period of time at Bluff school. The Bluff school house still stands but is in dire need of some tender loving care. Schools up and down the river have been destroyed or painted park service colors and used for storage instead of being preserved for historical purposes.

The Akers Cemetery sits on the hill overlooking Gladden Creek north of where the school sat. Both sets of my grandparents are buried there as well as aunts and cousins. My great- great grandparents on the Purcell side are also buried there. Several graves are marked with cave rock. My parents are not buried there because my mother feared the Park service would let it grow up and be destroyed. Before the national park, she and Dad and other community members took very good care of the cemetery. My brother Gene and I sit on the Akers Cemetery Board. He is the president; Richard Purcell, vice president; Jim Purcell treasurer and I am secretary at present. I never want the Akers cemetery to grow up and be destroyed like many cemeteries up and down the river. For example, the pre-Civil War Purcell family cemetery located on what was the Beanie Purcell place across from Cave Springs is grown up, grave markers lost, and cannot be found unless if you know exactly where you are going. Veterans are buried there. I never want the Akers cemetery to suffer the same fate.

After my parents were married, they built the store where it stands today. Half of the building was our home and the other half was the store. The store had a post office built in one corner of the building just like my grandparents store. My mother was the Post Master there as well as my father being the barber. It was the hub bub of the community. People gathered around the wood stove and told stories. People still traded for most everything they needed. Salesmen and traders would come through the area selling their goods and would repair what needed repairing.

Traditions and the Ozark Mountain People culture continued. The neighbors would take turns having square dancing in their homes. My father (Buck Maggard) was the fiddler on most evenings and my uncle Doc would market their moonshine. (My parents met each other at one of these dances.) life at Akers was good.

My parents, Buck and Loreen Maggard, bought a couple of canoes from Sears and Roebuck catalog to rent to people who might want to float, fish or just enjoy the Current River. He also built a campground on both sides of the river for campers to use. My dad would use his red 1950 model one and half ton cattle truck to haul floaters to and from the put in and take out points on the river. The people would ride in the back with the cattle panels protecting them. I remember some people enjoyed the ride in the truck almost as much and their boat ride. Canoeing really became popular. He bought Grumman aluminum canoes, Osage canoes, and various brands over the years. My parents never turned anyone away on reserving a canoe. They went and bought more until they had around 300 canoes before the Ozark National Scenic Riverways bought their land by eminent domain and reduced the amount of canoes they could rent. I will never forget the devastating news that the government was taking our property for recreation, the land that was so dear to us. It felt like we had a death in the family. I will never forget when the federal marshal came to serve papers on my father. My brothers (Eugene and Dwight) and I were instructed that we could not accept the papers so we turned the marshal away three or four times because dad was not present.

Well, one evening when everyone was sitting around the stove telling stories, the marshal came in and joined us. After a while he asked if anyone knew Buck Maggard and one of the local drunks spoke up and said, "There he is!" So the papers were served!!! After the park service came in, I will never forget that feeling of emptiness that I felt when I floated the river and all the neighbors were gone. There was not any one to stop and visit or share goodies like watermelon and pastries as you floated down the river.

Currently, my brother Eugene and family have the concession at Akers. They have a canoe rental and store where things that you might need on the river can be purchased. Eighteen years ago the park service closed the campground at Akers which had really hurt the economy. It cuts to the core that land that even the Indians loved years ago and tourist once enjoyed camping upon was closed by the government so that the sounds, smells and beauty of the river at that point can't be enjoyed as it had been for years.

The beautiful farm up the river that belonged to my grandparents and later my uncle Dee and Aunt Pearlle across from Welch's Cave was also purchased by the government It had a huge barn that housed all the animals from the chickens, sheep, horses and cows. The park service tore it down. The house (Maggard Cabin) was torn down to the log frame and is about half way restored. My aunt Pearlle and I loved fishing at the family's favorite fishing hole where she helped me catch my biggest trout.

I can hear Current River cry because all the people who grew up, loved and respected the river have had to move away. There is not anyone left to care for the land, the traditions, the culture and the structures (school houses and churches). It is the Ozark Scenic Riverways responsibility to preserve the history and culture of the area. So far they have shirked their responsibility. It has always left a sour taste in my mouth when park service personnel have asked what a building or place looked like when it was the park service that tore it down. Rules and regulations are being implemented to govern the park and limit the amount of tourists/users. It appears that the park service does not have the funds or manpower to manage all the acreage they took from all the people. Consequently, they need to come up with a plan that will protect and take care of the river and preserve the culture and traditions of the Ozark Mountain People. Everyone needs to be able to enjoy the river1 not a select few and never ever shut it down again!

Judy Maggard Stewart

JstewartOOI@centurytel.net

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2988    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** The lifeblood (livelihood, culture, recreation) of the people (Ozark Mountain people) of Round Springs, Missouri was centered around Current River and the surrounding mountains, valley's and creeks. The people of the community were trappers, hunters, fisherman, loggers, farmers, saw millers, merchants, postmasters, teachers, engineers and moonshiners. The economy of Round Springs depended upon the natural resources of the surrounding area. Round Springs had two general stores, (Carr's and Vaughn's Spring Valley Store) a post office, a state park, three canoe rentals( Carr's, Sullivan's, and Vaughn's) two lodging establishments,(Round Springs Lodge and Cottages, Bank's Cabins), two restaurants(Patterson's and Hinkle's) Round Spring's Cave, Spenser's Sawmill and Camp Zoe's Children's Camp.

The economy of Round Springs was adversely impacted by the Ozark National Scenic Riverways as the result of limiting access to the river and acquisition and then closure of most of the above mentioned businesses and of many existing roads and limiting access to the river. The only remaining business is Carr's Canoe Rental. The remaining access to the river are: Carr's Landing, Round Springs Middle Landing and Round Spring Lower landing (Asphalt). The following river access have been closed:

1. Road and access to Mose Prater Place
2. Vehicle access at mouth of Sinkin Creek
3. Access above Sinkin Creek Bridge
4. Road and access to Philchew and Willhite Hollow
5. Road and access to Tom Conway Place (Benton Hollow)
6. Access from Rt. 19 across river from Benton Hollow.
7. Access to Sawdust hole
8. Road and access to Courthouse Subdivision

Plainly speaking, most everything that made Round Springs a good community to live and visit is no longer available to the general public. Riverfront and Spring Branch camping have been virtually eliminated. Roads to favorite camping, fishing and hunting spots have been closed. Many older and handicapped people can no longer camp, fish or hunt due to limited vehicle access to the spring branch, river and surrounding area.

Law enforcement in Ozark National Scenic Riverways is a dismal failure. The geography of the park (90 miles long, Y2 mile wide) laced with county roads makes law enforcement extremely difficult. Let the general public keep the existing roads and trails for recreation and emergency use. Before the establishment of the ONSR the individual landowners enforced strict rules according to their way of thinking. People did not abuse the river and surrounding land; bad plan; the people became unwelcome. Now that the river and land is controlled by the National Park Service, lack of respect for the river, land and people is rampant. A few people are destroying the whole park. The attitude is that if something belongs to the government then people feel that they are entitled to do as they please. This attitude creates many problems for both the local people and tourist. Law enforcement needs to be highly visible, enforce existing regulations and educate the public. Management needs to develop regulations and have a management plan that provides for a positive experience for all the people.

The Management Plan developed by the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is written to satisfy well-funded special interest groups. The general population is unaware of the management plan and what they want does not seem to matter. I feel the general population wants the park managed in such a way that all people can access, use and enjoy the park while still maintaining and preserving it.

The Management Plan fails to address the social aspects of the people, (both the tourist and local communities). The plan fails to address the needs of the old and handicapped, the local businesses, the tourist. The plan promotes the Park for the Park's benefit and has become a bureaucracy that provides for and consumes itself from within. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways needs to be managed and run for the use and enjoyment of all the people, not a select few.

I grew up in the Round Spring's Community, working as a teenager for the Round Springs Lodge, Cottages, and Caverns; Camp Zoe Children's Camp, Round Springs State Park and Seasonal Park Ranger for the National Park Service. Round Springs is a microcosm of many communities throughout Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Many communities have all suffered and died with the help of the National Park Service. Favorite camping, fishing, and hunting spots are no longer accessible. Let's give the park back to the people, return it to the Missouri State Park System and manage it for the people, not special interest groups.

John J. Stewart

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2989	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,20,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	PARK SERVICE CHANGES LIVES				

Recalling the area below the confluence of the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers in the early 1940's through the 1970's, which was my early childhood, seems to be a formidable task. The warm community of people is no longer there as a result of the takeover of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

My parents were living in Chicago, IL where Dad and a partner had a profitable company that manufactured parts for equipment used by the military called Patlyn Gears. He invested some of his profits in a piece of property below the junction of the two rivers. At the time I was little girl of four years old when we moved to Shannon County. The property had a beautiful waterfall on the creek called Matthews Branch. His dream was to build a dam at the head of the falls and generate electricity. He wanted to have an all electric home in the Ozarks. The structure that was on the property was built initially for a summer home by people from St. Louis their last name was Ruhack. It was a very small two room structure with a wide front, screened porch. There was a hand pump in the back yard for water, a little house out back for sanitary purposes, no electricity or phone. It was a difficult move for my mother who was accustomed to a modern home. She learned to cook on the wood stove and to deal with the problem of laundry in the wilderness. Dad rigged up a generator that he placed in the little outhouse and set up a concrete slab under a lean-to attached to the side of the house as I recall Mom had to start the generator to help with running her wringer washing machine. I believe that she had a gas powered machine first and then graduated to the electric. In a few years my parents built a new home and a dam on Matthews Branch and set a generator. He was ready to complete his dream when the park service took their property by eminent domain. My father's dream was destroyed as a result of the National Park Service purchasing all his river front property thus preventing him access to the river and use of the ferry boat to be able to travel on the west side of the river.

We had next door neighbors in the summer, there were two small cabins that were owned by the Flarety family in St. Louis and members of the family came as often as they could. Down river from us was the Dan Corbin family and further down the river another family from St. Louis had two cabins owned by the Hertel family. Between the Flarety house and the Cooley shack was another small house where Mrs. Cooley lived, the mother of John, Sim, Joe, and Ernest. I believe they lived with their mother except when they were on duty for the ferry. Ernest Cooley was married and he and his wife lived in a farmhouse on the top of the mountain behind our house. Later, the Johnny Brown family lived there. At a small spring up on Matthews Branch Bob Brown lived with his large family. Some of the time this family lived on Thompson's Creek. And living further up the creek was a family by the name of Patterson.

The Cooley's brothers, John, Sim, and Joe, ran the ferry boat. They stayed in a small shack on the top of a hill that overlooked the river. When a car wanted to cross they would honk their horn and one of the men would come "set them across". The cars that crossed were usually going to an area called Himont which was a lumber community, Midridge, or Bunker. That road was built by WPA with a pick and shovel. The ferry boat and community of families are no longer at Two Rivers after the Park Service bought all the land in that area.

There was another summer cabin across a small stream next to the ferry that was Tony Swiney's. But I do not remember who owned it before them. There was a road that ran parallel to the river. It went to Thompson's Creek and served many families there and beyond. We lived on the North side of the river. At that section of the river the

hills were higher close to the river so when the river flooded these homes were safer. If you crossed to the south side of the river at that point there was a nice flood plain to take the excess water. The river road on that side of the river went to the Jack's Fork store and post office. We walked to the store most of the time to fetch our mail and to pick up necessities. The store and post office served all of the families previously mentioned. But there were more. The Botts' Sawmill set was across the Jacks Fork River in the 1930's and the George Fry family and his brother Jim's family lived on that land where the sawmill set had been. The children of these families attended school on Sutton's Creek. But got their mail at Jack's Fork; it was also true of the families that lived on Thompson creek.

The store and post office was owned Albert and Bertha Russell. They had a couple of small cabins that they rented out to summer visitors. The best I remember Bertha also preached to help supplement their income. I remember going to a preaching at Prairie Hollow in a wagon with Clifford Hunt. The Hunt family lived on the top of the long steep hill that led out of the river valley from the junction. They too got their mail and goods there and their children attended school at Sutton's Creek. The store sawmills, school, and post office all do not exist anymore as a result of purchase by the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The Russell family sold their business to Pete and Lois Salisbury and they had a family named Easton who was in partners with them initially. Their daughters were named Peggy and Kay. They constructed a lodge where they served family style meals and added more cabins, plus a shower house with toilets. Clients all went to a pump for water and filled buckets. There were horses for rent but most people came to float the rivers and fish. Any people who wanted to eat at the lodge let them know early in the day so sufficient food would be prepared. Salisbury's Lodge also could not survive due to what the park service has done to the community.

After the National Park Service came in everything changed. No families live in the area. The small farms are gone. The ferry boat is gone. The Post Office is gone. The lodge dining hall is a small store that services floaters. The resort that was at the junction is gone. This community of people and businesses died when the National Park Service bought all the land. It is gone forever just like other small communities up and down the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers. Large busses come to the old ferry landing and pick up or put in floaters. This community was destroyed as a result of the takeover by the government. Why can the government take our land for recreation when recreation was already being provided by the local people?

Joan Dix

Eminence, Mo

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2990	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	KENNEDY, KENNEDY, ROBBINS & YARBRO, LC				

January 17, 2014

Ozark National Scenic Riverways  
Attn: William Black & Russ Rungee  
404 Watercress Dr.  
POBox490  
Van Buren, Mo 63965

Sandra and Ian Morton PO Box 306  
Ellington, MO 63638

Re: Draft General Management Plan  
First Comment

Dear Bill and Russ:

I hope this correspondence finds you both doing well in the new year. I am submitting this letter as my first

comment on the newly released draft General Management Plan (GMP). I trust you will give the same due consideration.

## I. Regulation of the Waterway Surface

Public use of a particular waterway's surface is generally linked to the ownership of the waterway's bed. The determination of bed ownership, and corresponding rights over the waterway's surface, involves complicated interplays between navigability for title, the equal footing doctrine, public servitudes, prescriptive easements and the property clause.

Specific to the Ozark National Scenic Riverway (ONSR), if waterway segments are determined navigable for title, the State of Missouri is likely vested with title to the bed by virtue of equal footing. Conversely, if waterway segments are determined non-navigable for title, then the bed is likely vested in the federal government by virtue of title acquisition of adjacent land during ONSR's formation.

In those segments navigable for title, I suggest the federal government regulation of the waterway surface violates sovereignty principles not contemplated under the property clause. Additionally, those segments non-navigable for title, remain subject to those restrictions encumbering title. Once such encumbrance is a general servitude in favor of public use of the waterway surface. I suggest restricting this general servitude remains outside of the property clause, or at a minimum, is constrained to only those restrictions which are narrowly tailored to correct activity injurious to federal property interest.

As the above relates to the draft GMP, the National Park Service (NPS) makes a base assumption it has the authority to regulate the entire waterway surface within its geographic boundaries. This assumption is made without discussion as to riparian rights, Missouri's sovereignty and constitutional constraints of federal jurisdiction. For that reason, I respectfully request that the NPS address the following:

- Identify those waterway segments which are navigable for title;
- In those segments determined navigable for title, please explain NPS's regulatory authority over the waterway's surface;
- Identify those areas of the waterways which are non-navigable for title;
- In those segments determined non-navigable for title, please explain NPS's regulatory authority to restrict the general servitude in favor of public access, and;
- Finally, in those segments determined non-navigable for title where regulatory measures are planned, please address the anticipated costs of the public servitude's diminution and future potential "takings" litigation.

Finally, if after exploring the above comments NPS believes regulatory authority exists, I next ask for specific detailed facts justifying each waterway surface regulatory measure to be implemented. I do not believe the justifications stated in the draft GMP are sufficient to meet the heightened review standard necessitated by the riparian rights in play.

## II. Similar Issues with Land Restrictions.

I further question the propriety of certain road and gravel bar closures due to vested public interests prior to ONSR's ownership. While certain roads, trails, gravelbar crossings and/or gravelbar uses were not in existence prior to ONSR acquisition, several were. This past continuous hostile use predating federal title arguably renders that title subject to the same.

I suggest closures - or regulations restricting use beyond those uses common at title vestiture - of those areas in public use at ONSR's formation will operate as a taking. For that reason, I request that the NPS address the following:

- For those areas subject to closure or restrictions, what efforts were made to evaluate the prior public use and potential prescriptive rights, and;
- Please address the anticipated costs of future takings litigation.

Finally, I again request specific detailed facts justifying each regulatory land measure that restricts these prescriptive interests. I do not believe the justifications stated in the draft GMP are sufficient to meet the heightened review necessitated by the prescriptive rights in play.

### III. Sacrifice of the Recreational Purpose

Recreational use was a material consideration during ONSR's creation. The initial proposal for the establishment of an "Ozark National Monument" was defeated due to concerns it went too far in restricting recreational use. Subsequently, a compromise was reached in a proposal to create the "Ozark Scenic Riverways."

In the initial report by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the committee noted the geographic location of the riverways lends itself to the creation of a federal recreation area. The committee emphasized the "importance of creating Federal recreational areas" through establishing the Ozark Scenic Riverways. And, the then secretary of the interior, Stewart L. Udall, wrote in a correspondence to the committee that he wanted "to make clear that recreation is a purpose" of the proposal to create the Ozark Scenic Riverways.

The final bill creating the ONSR reflects this compromise. Specifically the stated purpose of the ONSR follows:

For the purpose of conservation and interpreting unique scenic and other natural values and objects of historic interest, including preservation of portions of the Current River and the Jacks Fork River in Missouri as free flowing streams, preservation of springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources thereof by the people of the United States . . .

Finally, in creating the ONSR, the drafters noted the Secretary's authority for conservation and management of natural resources could be utilized only to the extent it furthers ONSR's stated purposes. 16 U.S.C. 460m-5 Again, one such purpose is recreation.

The congressional intent is clear that recreational use stood on equal footing with the remaining stated purposes. However, this footing has continually eroded since ONSR's formation

I request that the NPS address the following:

-Why is recreational use subordinated junior to conservation and preservation? Examples of this subordination are found in multiple ONSR park policy statements, as follows:

" Provide the widest range and highest quality of recreational activities which are consistent with the purpose of the Riverways and which can be accommodated without undue impact. 1989 River Use Management Plan (emphasis added).

" Conditioning recreational use to only those "[opportunities] consistent with the preservation of the park unit's resources." GMP October 2013 draft, pg. 12

" "If a conflict occurs between visitor use and protection of resources, the intent of Congress is to favor resource protection." GMP October 2013 draft, pg.18.

-In making these policy statements, what consideration was given of 16 U.S. C. 1 a-1 directive that requires authority to be exercised so as to prevent "degradation of the values and purposes [e.g. recreational use] for which" a park has been created.

As to the specific proposed regulation of recreational uses, I ask you to address the following:

-What are the overriding governmental interest supporting the following restrictions/eliminations of recreational use:

" banning vehicular traffic on non-designated gravelbars;

" banning motorized watercraft on the Riverways through permanent and seasonal closures;

" implementing caps for the number of users undertaking certain recreational activities, e.g. watercraft, camper camping, etc ... ;

" closing 55 miles of vehicular road and trails;

" closing approximately 20 unidentified river access points;

- " closing 65 miles of equestrian trails;
- " implementing a permit system for equestrian users;
- " developing potential permit systems for watercraft users, and
- " imposing new horsepower restrictions below Big Springs.

- What alternatives were considered by the ONSR for protecting these interests, and why were these alternatives not chosen?
- Are there any more narrowly tailored alternatives for protecting these interests, and if so, why were these alternatives not chosen?
- How do these restrictions further ONSR's recreational purpose?
- How do these restrictions degrade the recreational purpose, and is such degradation permissible under 16 U.S. C. 1a-1?

#### IV. Waterway Restrictions

The draft GMP proposes three waterway zones: mixed use, seasonal mixed use and nonmotorized. The later two zones limit motorized watercraft use only. I ask for the NPS to comment on the following:

- What are the overriding governmental interests necessitating motorized watercraft elimination in certain areas of the waterways?
- If that interest was to create differing user experiences?
  - " What considerations, if any, were given to the river levels seasonal fluctuations preventing motorized watercraft?
  - " What considerations, if any, were given to differing volumes of motorized watercraft during seasonal weather changes?
- If seasonal weather and river level fluctuations were considered, why were they determined insufficient to adequately create differing user experiences?
- How does eliminating motorized watercraft further ONSR's recreational purpose?
- How does eliminating motorized watercraft degrade the recreational purpose, and is such degradation permissible under 16 U.S. C. 1 a-1?
- Is the elimination of motorized watercraft -in violation of the general servitude in favor of public use? If so, what are the anticipated takings cost.
- Is the elimination of motorized watercraft in violation of prescriptive rights predating ONSR's title? If so, what are the anticipated takings cost.

I suggest eliminating motorized watercraft is unnecessary, overbroad, and outside of regulatory authority. The NPS should shift its focus to provide users information concerning the best times and locations to obtain their desired experience.

#### V. Land Based Restrictions

The draft GMP land based management zones are separated into four categories: Developed, Resource-based recreation; Natural, and; Primitive. I ask for the NPS to address the following:

- What are the overriding governmental interests that supports 72% natural land zoning?
  - " How is that interest furthered through limiting recreation to only those lowimpact uses where "evidence of human use would be limited"
  - " How does this zoning concept further ONSR's recreational purpose?
  - " How do these restrictions degrade the recreational purpose, and is such degradation permissible under 16 U.S. C. 1a-1?



-What are the overriding governmental interests that supports 16.4% primitive landzoning?  
" How does this zoning concept further ONSR's recreational purpose?  
" How do these restrictions degrade the recreational purpose, and is such degradation permissible under 16 U.S.C. 1a-1?

If zoning is utilized, I suggest the zone consistent with all stated purposes is Resources-based recreation. With modifications to allow amenities which are minimally detractive from aesthetic values, the Resource-based recreation concept can properly balance recreational use with conservation and resource preservation. Has this been considered by the NPS? If so, and if a determination was made that conservation and resource preservation could not be accommodated within Resource-based recreation zones, please provide the reasons said conclusion was reached.

## VI Visitor Use Management

To address perceived congestion, the draft GMP implements Visitor Experience Indicators and Standards. The NPS states these standards are an attempt to limit excessive users, or disruptive uses, inconsistent with the desired river zone. As it relates to the standards, I ask the NPS to address the following:

-Why are the watercraft "caps" based on historic watercraft users instead of capacity?

-What reasons support your decision to exclude tubes from the definition of watercraft?

-The 6 camper restriction is ambiguous. Please provide clarification as to its intended meaning?

" In implementing designated gravel bar campsites, did the NPS conduct studies to compare congestion on holiday vs. non-holiday weekends?

" If congestion is not present on non-holiday weekends, did the NPS consider more narrowly tailored management approaches to correct the specific holiday congestion in lieu of a blanket management strategy?

" If a narrowly tailored solution was considered, please advise what solutions were considered, and why the same were rejected.

-Please explain why the disorderly conduct standard is not river segment specific.

As the same relates to corrective measures, I ask the NPS to address the following:

-Did the NPS consider that the stated corrective measures may prevent future management discretion to consider changing uses and recreational technology?

-If disruptive behavior problems occur in specific river segments, does the NPS intend to implement corrective measures throughout the entire riverways, even non-problem areas?

-Please explain the logic of requiring quieter boats as a corrective measure for excessive watercraft users.

" This corrective measure has nothing to do with overcrowding, the stated purpose for implementing the standards.

-Please provide greater detail to the potential water craft permit system

While regulating by numbers is logical to counter congestion, it is illogical to regulate disruptive uses. In so far as the visitor standard's purpose is to regulate disruptive uses, planning by numbers should be abandoned. Rather the NPS should implement a management strategy that squarely addresses the perceived problem.

## VII Primary Objective and Favored Use

The preferred alternative's seeks to convert the vast majority of the park to a natural area where evidence of human use is minimal. Similarly, the favored user experience is the ability to "observe native wildlife, explore a cave, or ponder the size of a spring flow" in solitude.

While the concept of a natural area may be desired by some, others favor recreation based improvements and

amenities. Additionally, while pondering the size of a spring flow in solitude is an important user experience, equally important are those social experiences realized between friends and family.

No one use should predominate to the exclusion of another use, and policy formulated to accomplish the same is unnecessary. Seasonal river conditions provide both experiences. Social recreational uses predominately occur on summer weekends, the avid "spring ponderers" will find solitude during the week, winter, spring and fall.

#### VIII. Horsepower Restrictions

I commend the NPS for recognizing the need for larger horsepower motors to safely navigate jon boats with family sized loads. At present, the 60/40hp motors minimally accommodate the same.

That stated, why are horsepower restrictions necessary? If the intended purpose is to reduce excessive speeds, why not implement speed limits? If the intended purpose is to control wake, why not implement wake restrictions or boat weight restrictions?

Whatever the claimed justifications for limiting horsepower, I ask the NPS to consider if an alternative narrowly tailored regulatory measure exists to accomplish the desire objective.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2991	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	January 18, 2014				

Superintendent  
Ozark National Scenic Riverways  
PO Box 490  
Van Buren, MO 63965

REGARDS: Support of "No Action Alternative General Plan"

Superintendent:

The very first impression I received from review of the General Plans were the use of the negative term "No Action" Alternative General Plan to describe the present National Park Service's General Plan. That immediately showed the National Park Service's bias and activism by those who prepared the General Plan alternatives. It was clear to this reader that the purpose of using this negative term was to deceive the public that the National Park Service did not have adequate protection authority over the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. In fact within the opening "Executive Summary" the first subject being the "Purpose of the Plan", readers are subjected to immediate bias and activism; "The first general management plan for the National Riverways was completed in 1984, and this plan served the park unit well for many years. However, the 1984 plan is outdated and the NPS Riverways is now facing an increasing array of issues that require guidance through an updated, approved general management plan. A new plan is needed for the following reasons: etc."

The following are comments that support the present General Management Plan that the National Park Services is using to operate and manage the property within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Park.

1. The present General Plan (No Action Alternative General Plan) is clearly not being considered by the National Park Service. However, it is being presented to the public as one of four Draft General Plans under consideration.
2. I could find no reference where the Chief Executive Officer of Missouri, Governor Jay Nixon, endorsed any of the Draft General Plans submitted by the National Park Service. I did see where he and others in the state government were sent copies of the Draft General Plan after it was developed and ready for approval. I doubt that he or anyone in our state government realizes that the present General Plan (No Action Alternative General Plan) is not under consideration as referenced in my opening comment. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways Act states; "In furtherance of the purposes of this subchapter, the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the State of Missouri, its

political subdivisions, and other Federal agencies and organizations in formulating comprehensive plans for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and for the related watershed of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers in Missouri, and to enter into agreements for the implementation of such plans."

I would hope that our Governor and all elected officials of Missouri would insist, per the language of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Act, that they must be a partner during the development of the Draft Plan rather than being treated as an "after thought" and given a subservient role by the federal government.

3. On January 2, 2014, our Missouri Lieutenant Governor Peter Kinder, wrote in the Cape Girardeau Missouri newspaper "Southeast Missourian" a Guest Column titled "State Better Equipped to Manage Parks" regarding the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. His concluding statement was "Its time for Missouri to begin efforts to reclaim this resource from the federal government". His statement is referencing the "reversion" clause of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Act which allows Missouri to take back the state parks that were conditionally given to the federal government. As the second highest executive officer in Missouri, he sits on the Missouri's Property Board which has control over state property and buildings. Also, the Lieutenant Governor is a member of Missouri's Development Finance Board and the Tourism Commission that are housed in the Department of Economic Development. The Lieutenant Governor essentially has notified the National Park Service in writing that they have not cooperated with the State of Missouri in developing the Draft General Plan and have violated the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Act. His statement serves as a rejection of the National Park Service's preparation, activism and bias that treats the State of Missouri and its citizens as submissive components of their future plans to restrict access. The planned restrictions will adversely affect Missouri's tourism and economic development within an area of the state that is economically distressed per the defining guidelines of the federal government agency Delta Regional Authority.

Sincerely,

Richard Pretz  
294 Hickory Meadow Lane  
Poplar Bluff, MO 63901

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2992	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,20,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				

**Correspondence:** I think that we already have too many regulations on the riverway. Maybe the tourists don't understand how to take care of our environment but we local people have been taking care of it for years before there was a park service and I think we must have done a really good job or else all the tourists wouldn't want to come here and enjoy OUR home.

We are very capable of regulating ourselves and don't need someone who has never been here telling us what we need to do. In this area there is really no need for a park service.

The people here take a lot of pride in our area. This is our home and this is our heritage that we are talking about. I'm reminded of a lady that met a man and found that he was perfect in every way, so she married him, and the first thing she wanted to do was start changing him. The rivers, the streams, the woods and lakes were perfect when the park service got here that's what they wanted then, now the thirst that they can express it now. The people that buy boats, motors, trailers, tires, gas, fishing licenses, hunting licenses and such really support this area not the people that came here and bring their beers with them once a year for 2 days. The local people spend ALL their money here and support what is here not the tourists. They don't bring enough income for this area to cater to them. The park service is supported by my taxes and need to listen to the people that are affected every day by their decisions.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2993	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,20,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	No action alternative				

Keep government small

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2994    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I support No-acting alternative

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2995    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I believe that it is in the best interest of both the National Park Service and the citizens that there be NO Action. I say this because it is irrelevant that the local people of southern Missouri be punished because of tourist being unhappy with boats on the river. I agree one hundred percent that the tourist have as much right to the river as the local people therefore why penalize the locals who pay as many taxes as the tourists spend money. I as a local have as much right to the rivers as the tourist do, so why am I getting restricted more and more, why the tourist gain more of the river for canoeing or floating. I have no issue sharing the river with anyone I do have problems getting restricted more and more.

I believe that our heritage as a born citizen of the Ozarks relays being on the riverways. I want my kids and grand kids to be able to enjoy our riverways like I did. That's not going to be possible if more and more regulations from the park service are put in place.

Truthfully the tourist are getting cattered to by the plans put in place that is not fair to the local people. We already have streams that are regulated like jacks fourth and upper current were we cant go if we don't have small 25 horse motors. The upper parts of the river like jack fork regulates its self in the summertime anyway. Its to shallow to run these places any way. This is not going to solve the issues between motor boats and tourist. If anything its going to make it worse. People will hold grudges against tourist, and the park service. There will be even bigger controversy between everyone. We should all be able to use the riverways as we want along with the accesses. If there that much problems on the river maybe more law enforcement is the issue. But restrictions is not the answer. I personally am going to use the riverway as I always have along with many other people.

NO ACTION the right CHOICE

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2996    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Leave it alone

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2997    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I kow we have to have laws but we want to keep are 40, 60 motors we take care of the river by keeping clean and try to keep others safe.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2998    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I feel that no action should be taken at this time. Everything and everyone are working well. This is just a away for the park service to get more money to spend unwisely. The federal governement does not care about local people or our way of life. We just want things left alone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2999    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dont take away the river

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3000    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** As, a local to this area I would like for NPS to LEAVE this area alone. We enjoy this area and would like for it to stay the way it is!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3001 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** My name is Curtis Black and I am 58 years old I went fishing on Current River for the first time when I was 8 years old. My family have lived here for at least 75 years and my family now owns businesses and depend on the river for a major part of our income. Since my first fishing trip I have seen very few changes in the quality of the river or the fishing and I spend most weekends on or around the river. I own a big motor and stay mostly on the lower Current from Big Springs down I see nothing that would warrant any change in the river. As we have it now I hope that local customs would be considered in the park services plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3002 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I believe that "no changes" is the absolute only way to continue with the National Park Services' service. Any other plan is in my opinion unacceptable. It is our right as citizen to use the land that is here and the limitations in the other plans keep us from being able to use these rights.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3003 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I do not want to see any more restrictions put on the use of ONSR. I want my grandkids and their grandkids to enjoy, camping, fishing, boating, floating, swimming and use of the river and surrounding area as my parents, grandparents and great grandparents and I have. ONSR seems unconcerned with local tradition and widely influence by special groups who do not understand local traditions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3004 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I am a believer in conservation and responsible stewardship of our beautiful river. I think the time has come for action to protect the river. I agree with the restrictions porposed, however I do no believe it is necessary to exclude motor boats during the winter above cedar grove for those who enjoy jogging. As an ardent conoe enthusiast I have not found boats to be a hinderance to my safety or enjoyment. Forgive my spelling.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3005 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I would like no action to be taken. My family and I enjoy camping on the gravel bar at the log yard and boating on the river. Restricted areas will be very bac for our family as well as many others.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3006 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I would like to see the river left alone. Me and my family enjoy it just how it is. If you would enforce the regulations already in place you could cover the majority of your problems.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3007 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I think the river should be left alone. I enjoy the river just as it is. Me and my family camp on the log yard every summer on my uncles camper.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3008    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I think the river should be let alone and let the people enjoy it as it was meant to be  
NO ACTION

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3009    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Leave as is - the land belongs to teh people not the government. We have used this river and land all of our lives an dwant our grandkids to use it like we have - Keep the people that don't know anything about our river, worry about this.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3010    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Leave the boats as they are now. Make more hiking trails. Improve campsites that already exist on the river. More law enforcement in summer.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3011    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for holding this open house

---

As a native Missourian whose family has lived in southern MO going back to the original settlers and Osage and Cherokee peoples, I am in favor of Alternative A. I believe that we need to protect the rivers as much as possible as I have seen the water quality and fishing degrade within my lifetime.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3012    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** My comment on the proposal is leave it alone. This is public land payed for by the tax payer and further meddling would only lead to more more closure and less access. Quit frankly the whole proposal is an undeffind and open ended waste of thx payer money.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3013    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** No change is the only desirable alternative.  
Any change other than giving back the management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways back to the State of Missouri would have a detrimental impact on the economy and culture of our region.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3014    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I support no change. It is fine the way it is.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3015    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** After nearly 50 yrs of NPS management I am somewhat satisfied with the status quo.  
No change on anything now or in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3016    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Please leave the rivers alone

No action

all the other plans will destroy our economy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3017 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I am opposed to any and all plans that would restrict usage of any kind on the riverways. Most of our rivers will regulate itself. People aren't going to take their boats where they are likely to tear something up. Besides we live here and this is our land. we are very tired of being pushed around. Limiting the motor size will not clean up the river. You cannot just cater to the floaters. I have fished and hunted on the river for more than thirty years. I would hate for my kids not to be able to do the same, and have the same heritage as I have. Any of these plans is just a slap in the face to the local people.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3018 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I think you should leave the Rivers alone. It seems to me the local people have been doing a pretty good job taking care of it all this time. The only thing this is going to do is hurt the local people and businesses. why try to fix something when it isn't broke. Some of us just want to go and enjoy the river with what we already have. If things change a lot of people would have to buy new motors and some people can't afford to, so they would be screwed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3019 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** My name is River Rowland I'm nine years old.

I have been enjoying ONSR (the river) my whole life.

I always respect other peoples use of the river. I also pick up trash to keep the river pretty. I support the no action alternative, because I enjoy my boat rides on Jacks Fork and Current river. I also enjoy my overnight canoe trips.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3020 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Like Mgmt Plan B with exception of wilderness area - I know pres & congress must approve - Irish Wilderness is enough in this area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3021 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Please mail to the National Park Service's Regional Director, Michael Reynolds at 601 Riverfront Drive, Omaha, NE 68102; (402) 661-1736.

---

Public Comment concerning the ONSR Draft General Management Plan:

I am writing as a concerned citizen regarding the effects the Draft General Management Plan will have to the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. Our area relies on the tourism industry, and shutting down access to the river will have devastating effects on our local economy. For decades, the people of Missouri have successfully maintained and preserved the health of the rivers and their surrounding areas. Local folks are more than capable of ensuring the health of the rivers, while permitting the public to use and enjoy the land they pay to preserve. I strongly recommend that the National Park Service take a No-Action Alternative to prevent unnecessary restrictions on public lands, preserve private landowner property rights, and protect our local tourism industry.

I consider these comments to be "substantive" and as such would appreciate a response. In the event that you believe they are not "substantive" please provide me with a methodology for making that determination and an explanation

for how that allows you to ignore this comment.

No-Action Alternative

I support it !! :)

I oppose Wilderness Area

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3022    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Please mail to the National Park Service's Regional Director, Michael Reynolds at 601 Riverfront Drive, Omaha, NE 68102; (402) 661-1736.

Public Comment concerning the ONSR Draft General Management Plan:

I am writing as a concerned citizen regarding the effects the Draft General Management Plan will have to the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. Our area relies on the tourism industry, and shutting down access to the river will have devastating effects on our local economy. For decades, the people of Missouri have successfully maintained and preserved the health of the rivers and their surrounding areas. Local folks are more than capable of ensuring the health of the rivers, while permitting the public to use and enjoy the land they pay to preserve. I strongly recommend that the National Park Service take a No-Action Alternative to prevent unnecessary restrictions on public lands, preserve private landowner property rights, and protect our local tourism industry.

I consider these comments to be "substantive" and as such would appreciate a response. In the event that you believe they are not "substantive" please provide me with a methodology for making that determination and an explanation for how that allows you to ignore this comment.

I have lived here 46 years and I feel that if the park service could enforce the law they have the local people could get along better with them and maybe even believe them I want no changes in the way we have here now we have plenty of rules the way it is.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3023    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Please mail to the National Park Service's Regional Director, Michael Reynolds at 601 Riverfront Drive, Omaha, NE 68102; (402) 661-1736.

Public Comment concerning the ONSR Draft General Management Plan:

I am writing as a concerned citizen regarding the effects the Draft General Management Plan will have to the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. Our area relies on the tourism industry, and shutting down access to the river will have devastating effects on our local economy. For decades, the people of Missouri have successfully maintained and preserved the health of the rivers and their surrounding areas. Local folks are more than capable of ensuring the health of the rivers, while permitting the public to use and enjoy the land they pay to preserve. I strongly recommend that the National Park Service take a No-Action Alternative to prevent unnecessary restrictions on public lands, preserve private landowner property rights, and protect our local tourism industry.

I consider these comments to be "substantive" and as such would appreciate a response. In the event that you believe they are not "substantive" please provide me with a methodology for making that determination and an explanation for how that allows you to ignore this comment.

This river has been the life of our town for centuries. People have been driving boats and going gigging and fishing forever. People that are not from here and don't understand our family values and traditions don't need to take our



boats away. The locals that are driving boats actually save people's lives. I know we have saved several people floating during the summers. I vote there be no change to the current laws of the river and the boats. I want to teach my kids how to go gigging when they grow up and I can't do that if we have no boats to do it with.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3024    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Please mail to the National Park Service's Regional Director, Michael Reynolds at 601 Riverfront Drive, Omaha, NE 68102; (402) 661-1736.

Public Comment concerning the ONSR Draft General Management Plan:

I am writing as a concerned citizen regarding the effects the Draft General Management Plan will have to the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. Our area relies on the tourism industry, and shutting down access to the river will have devastating effects on our local economy. For decades, the people of Missouri have successfully maintained and preserved the health of the rivers and their surrounding areas. Local folks are more than capable of ensuring the health of the rivers, while permitting the public to use and enjoy the land they pay to preserve. I strongly recommend that the National Park Service take a No-Action Alternative to prevent unnecessary restrictions on public lands, preserve private landowner property rights, and protect our local tourism industry.

I consider these comments to be "substantive" and as such would appreciate a response. In the event that you believe they are not "substantive" please provide me with a methodology for making that determination and an explanation for how that allows you to ignore this comment.

In regards to the recommended changes to North boundary to Round Springs this section of the river is very low during the summer months and not usable by boats. Changing would only affect the locals who like to gig and other similar activities during the off season months. WHY regulate a section of river that regulates it's self? As far as changing the hp from the spring to the south boundary, I take my family there every weekend during the summer as my family has done for generations. We RARELY come across any floaters, this area is not a problem so why change it?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3025    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Please mail to the National Park Service's Regional Director, Michael Reynolds at 601 Riverfront Drive, Omaha, NE 68102; (402) 661-1736.

Public Comment concerning the ONSR Draft General Management Plan:

I am writing as a concerned citizen regarding the effects the Draft General Management Plan will have to the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. Our area relies on the tourism industry, and shutting down access to the river will have devastating effects on our local economy. For decades, the people of Missouri have successfully maintained and preserved the health of the rivers and their surrounding areas. Local folks are more than capable of ensuring the health of the rivers, while permitting the public to use and enjoy the land they pay to preserve. I strongly recommend that the National Park Service take a No-Action Alternative to prevent unnecessary restrictions on public lands, preserve private landowner property rights, and protect our local tourism industry.

I consider these comments to be "substantive" and as such would appreciate a response. In the event that you believe they are not "substantive" please provide me with a methodology for making that determination and an explanation for how that allows you to ignore this comment.

I see no reason to modify the rules the park fills in managing the park, especially cutting local residents from having use of the park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3026 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Please mail to the National Park Service's Regional Director, Michael Reynolds at 601 Riverfront Drive, Omaha, NE 68102; (402) 661-1736.

Public Comment concerning the ONSR Draft General Management Plan:

I am writing as a concerned citizen regarding the effects the Draft General Management Plan will have to the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. Our area relies on the tourism industry, and shutting down access to the river will have devastating effects on our local economy. For decades, the people of Missouri have successfully maintained and preserved the health of the rivers and their surrounding areas. Local folks are more than capable of ensuring the health of the rivers, while permitting the public to use and enjoy the land they pay to preserve. I strongly recommend that the National Park Service take a No-Action Alternative to prevent unnecessary restrictions on public lands, preserve private landowner property rights, and protect our local tourism industry.

I consider these comments to be "substantive" and as such would appreciate a response. In the event that you believe they are not "substantive" please provide me with a methodology for making that determination and an explanation for how that allows you to ignore this comment.

Any areas along the river are memories to so many families, generations & family gatherings, fishing, boating, hunting, swimming. The Ozarks is made up of real people & who live here for its beauty & because we love the outdoors.

We pay our taxes, we work for lower wages just to be able to live here. We love the river & closing more access roads, moror sizes will hurt our income both to provate business, county, state & to federal. More regulation is not the answer - enforcing laws on the books would keep you busy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3027 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** Sirs:

I wish to register my strongest opposition to your plans for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways'. It appears your plans conveniently support radical environmental desires to create more wilderness rather than consider those who actually use and love the area. I strongly suspicion an Agenda 21 connection somewhere. I am 71, have spent many of those years camping, canoeing, hiking and hunting the Current River/Jacks Fork area. Personally I fondly recall the old Akers Ferry and the private campground we used there for many years. I was never bothered in those days by your NPS air driven patrol boats which I still find a gross intrusion on the solitude of that river. Enough government intrusion is enough. Please just leave it as is? May I strongly suggest you assume the "no change" policy toward the ONSR? Please? Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3028 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Black,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan/Wilderness Study/EIS. This letter contains the formal comments of the International Mountain Bicycling Association (IMBA). We at IMBA, urge you to give increased consideration for mountain biking for this and future plans. We oppose the no-action plan, which will continue the prohibition of mountain biking on all trails within the Scenic Riverways. With mountain biking currently disallowed on all existing trails and bicycling on the roads discouraged by the Scenic Riverways web page, it does not allow visitors the fuB range of recreational options available from other state and national areas.

Missouri was named "Best Trail State" of 2013 which has a large and active mountain bike population with IMBA chapter affiliations that if given the opportunity, would use, enhance, and help maintain public access for these trails including all user groups.

Founded in 1988, IMBA leads the national and worldwide mountain bicycling communities through a network of 80,000 individual supporters, 750 affiliate clubs, and 600 dealer members. IMBA teaches sustainable trail building techniques and has become a leader in trail design, construction, and maintenance; encourages responsible riding, volunteer trail work, and cooperation among trail user groups and land managers. Each year, IMBA members, chapters and supporting organizations conduct more than 750,000 hours of volunteer trail stewardship on America's public lands and are some of the best assistants to federal, state, and local land managers.

Bicycling is low impact, active recreation that enhances the visitor experience

Mountain Bicycling is Low impact. Numerous scientific studies exist regarding the natural resource impacts of mountain biking showing that mountain bicycles do not disturb the environment any more than hiking, and significantly less than equestrian and motorized uses.

Active Recreation: Bicycling broadens the recreational offerings and helps Americans get exercise. It connects people with the natural world and is fun. Fun, active recreation directly contributes to the physical and mental well being of the people of the United States.

Relevancy for Youth: Many parks lack relevance with today's youth - bicycling is a great way to help kids fall in love with parks and become future stewards. According to the Outdoor Industry Foundation, bicycling is the number one gateway activity that gets kids outside and ultimately interested in other activities such as hiking, camping, and fishing. Kids don't fall in love with the outdoors at a visitor center or information kiosk, they want to explore and have fun.

Improves Visitation and Visitor Experience: Visitation numbers are down at many NPS units. Improving opportunities for bicycling and promoting trails tourism could benefit economic conditions for nearby communities. Once inside the Park, visitors on trails traveling by foot or bicycle can immerse themselves in the natural experience rather than simply observing it from roads inside cars and RVs.

Mountain Bikers Volunteer: Many NPS trails are in disrepair. Annually, mountain bicyclists conduct almost one million hours of trail work on public lands. Volunteers from the mountain bike community can help build environmentally sound, sustainable trails.

Thank you for your time and careful consideration of our comments. We look forward to a productive relationship in the future. Please feel free to call us (303) 545-9011 (Boulder Office) or email (steve.schneider@imba.com). If we can be of further assistance.

Respectfully Submitted,

Steve Schneider

South Central Regional Director

International Mountain Bicycling Association

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3029	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Mr. Black:				

RE: Review of Draft Environmental Impact Statement/General Management Plan for Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Missouri

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/General Management Plan for Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Our review is provided pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act 42 U.S.C. 4231, Council on Environmental Quality regulations 40 C.F.R. Parts 1500-1508, and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. The DEIS was assigned the Council on Environmental Quality number 20130325.

Based on our overall review and the level of our comments, the EPA has rated the DEIS for this project LO (Lack of Objections). A copy of EPA's rating descriptions is provided as an enclosure to this letter.

The DEIS adequately outlines the purpose, need, and general management plan for this project. The preferred Alternative (B) seems to address and provide a good balance of the various uses and resources of ONSR. We commend your coordination efforts with various other agencies and entities throughout the development of this

project. We would encourage continued coordination with local, state, and federal agencies to ensure that all laws, ordinances, and regulations are followed and all necessary permits acquired. We also would like to thank you for prominently addressing the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of each potential environmental consequence.

Though environmental impacts included in the DEIS were overall minimal, EPA offers the following comments for additional considerations of potential environmental impacts and a focus on minimization and mitigation of these impacts and provide additional information related to the project.

While it is understood that the proposed management process would allow for site-dependent flexibility in management and mitigation practices, it would be useful in instances such as these to include at least a few specific examples of practices and procedures that may be used to meet these directives and how health and condition will be measured. EPA continues to support avoiding and minimizing adverse impacts to air, land, and water quality, including wildlife and their habitat. We would like to suggest that any potential effects or disturbance of fish and wildlife species be minimized to the extent possible through the use of BMPs for such activity.

In the event that there are jurisdictional wetlands impacted by the proposed action, we recommend that any mitigation should occur in the same HUC 8 or smaller watershed as the location of the project impacts. If changes occur in the project purpose, need, alternatives, or impacts between now and the time of issuance of Public Notice, EPA's 404 program reserves the ability to comment further on this project. Information may be generated through the 404 public interest review process that was not documented during the EIS process and should be considered in the final decision. This could include changes in regulation or processes, advances in the knowledge of the resources to be impacted, discovery of populations of threatened or endangered species, new best management practices, and/or improvement in stream or wetland restoration science.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide our comments regarding this project. If you have any questions, please contact Amber Tucker, NEPA Reviewer, at 913-551-7565 or via email at tucker.amber@epa.gov.

Sincerely,  
Jeffery Robichaud  
Deputy Director  
Environmental Services Division

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3030	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,20,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	E-mail				

**Correspondence:** Im for no action on the proposed changes to the Park. And one of my reasons is quality of life would be diminished not enhanced. Adding more rules more regulations etc is not the answer. Taking away a individuals way of life, supposedly for the good of the majority is hog wash. Sounds all good in theory but it is not practical. The few complaint's in proportion to the visitors is hardly even measurable. What is it about 20 complaints with thousands of visitors. Your never going to make everyone happy. Americans can't totally agree on much of anything. That"s what makes this country so great to live in. More government and more tax dollars is not the answer. Restricting a individuals rights and quality of life of a person living in this area has to be the most important concern. sounds selfish but it isn't. what if everyone in the United States went around unhappy and felt restricted? Sounds like communism to me. My comments more than likely be in vain. But I fought for my country, paid taxes my whole life. Paid into Social security my entire life and am 70 years old now. And I don't want anything more changed. People say change is needed for the good of future generations and in a lot of cases it is true. But not in the future, when everything is so regulated with tours. guides. more rule more regulations, it will suffocate all the good intentions.. I was brought up to reslect the land and people . You either have it or you don't. Respectfully< jOHN IINKUL

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3031	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,19,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	E-mail				

**Correspondence:** My topic is ECONOMICS that covers just about every thing.I'm over 70 yrs old and am commenting not for myself much but I feel strongly about this subject.What or who does it help to take something away from people. I live outside Eminence. These people in Shannon county are on a whole fine ,decent friendly

law abiding citizens. They wave to everybody they see. It is one of the poorest counties in Mo. And for the life of me I cant comprehend how some entity has the gall to come in and try to change another ccommunity's and county's quality of life to the worse instead of better. Who would feel good about doing so. Eminence relies on the tourist for most of its tax dollars. If tourist decline, who pays more the citizens of the entire county. who is affected the most the citizens again in higher taxes. Their quality of life. And what do they tell their grandchildren..? Kids this is what it used to be?? You cant do any of this now.. People have come in here and took away all your quality of life.. Think about it when you make your decision again I am writing this for the good of all the fine folk who live and raise their families here. Respectfully John IINKUL

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3032 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** I am concerned about the planning, development of the Ozark National Waterway, esp the Current River. I am a resident of Mo and am a avid outdoor person. I have paddled the Current river many times. Sometimes, on a holiday weekend, I could not place my paddle in the water without hitting the canoe next to me. It is extremely overcrowded. Paddling in Oct was less crowded, but the multitude of horses crossing the river was large. There are huge ranches corralling horses, creating to the pollution of the river. This river is designated as a National Park, yet is is getting very polluted. Would we let the same occur in the Grand Canyon or Yellowstone? It should be used by the public, but not destroyed by horse feces and atvs destroying the quality of the water. I am a member of The St Louis Canoe Kayak club, Missouri White Water association, St Louis Adventure Group, Team River Runner, and Lets Hike.  
I am a registered voter.  
Kathleen Pszonka

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3033 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,19,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** The plan does not provide assurances and or protection for the traditional uses of the riverway. The plan must be more descriptive on the degree and types of uses that will be permitted- with specificity.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3034 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,31,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** This is response to the Draft General Management Plan ("Plan"), October 2013  
Preface:

On September 25, 2012 while loading our jonboat on trailer, a park ranger told a fellow senior citizen and me that our use of the upper portion of Current River was about to end. He suggested that we get a canoe. In order to adapt, he said that I should begin a regiment of exercise. Being 70 years of age in conjunction with the effects of rheumatoid and osteoarthritis on my hands and shoulders precludes much paddling. Because of these limitations we use a small 25 hp outboard engine with an electric starter. The ranger's motives for the admonitions were uncertain, but it appeared that he enjoyed the delivery of the news. As is often true during our visits, on that day there appeared to be no other people using the river in the Akers area.

If we are expected to canoe, it would require another vehicle for shuttling. Our grandchildren and I would be unable to float without an additional, accompanying licensed driver. Canoe usage would also add two more hours of ancillary activity for launching, loading, unloading, and swapping vehicles. Due to the cost, we do not have a second vehicle. And my deformed arthritic knees inhibit bank fishing activity. For me and similarly handicapped individuals, these factors make use of a jonboat nearly mandatory. The current rules make the portion above Akers available from September 15 to May for our jonboat. Although the Plan indicates otherwise, the 18 miles from Akers to Round Spring are available year-around (see footnote). All Plan proposed changes would eliminate our usage above Akers, and greatly limit our enjoyment of the remaining portion to Round Spring.

History:

Current has very fine fishing from Welch Spring to Round Spring. With little success on November 17, 2013 a friend bank fished at Akers. The following day we launched our jonboat at Akers and traveled upstream two holes. On the float back, it continued to be common to catch trout of 17". On the third day, we launched at Round Spring and went up to Sinking Creek. During the float back, my friend caught several smallmouth. Couple this experience with the closeness to mother's house in Houston and her delight of fish dinners, then you can understand how

cherished these opportunities are.

Whether for the individual fishing, inclusion of a larger portion of family, or in conjunction with enjoying scenery, we are known to visit upper Current several times per month. We have been doing this for well over a half century. Behavior:

When on the river we often pull over to sit motionless while others pass. We use these occasions to have conversations with fellow visitors about the area, fishing success, or the absolutely beautiful scenery. A common question concerns the distance to the next take-out. 2

If we pass a canoe or any other vessel, we do so in quiet water at a speed and distance so as to cause no disruption. Even at floating speed, we attempt to never pass in a riffle unless there is ample space. It is my understanding that law requires all motorized boats to yield to non-motorized boats. We always adhere to that principle.

Due to the actions of canoe clientele with their attendant congestion, rowdiness, noise, and disruption we stay away from the Akers area during the three months of summer. We have learned that a continuous parade of canoes and the above listed accompanying factors are not conducive to fishing nor relaxing. However the other nine months of the year offer increased opportunities for relaxation, family fun, and fishing in this area. Before it became too busy and our handicaps dictated, we logged many canoeing miles on upper Current.

Although the prevailing rules allow our year around boating of Current's 18 miles from Akers down to Round Spring, we visit only the 4 miles portion from Round Spring up to the Jerry Presley Conservation Education Center. Due to the frequency of canoes, we do not visit even that small stretch during summer weekends. In this way, we often see very few others on the water. By completely banning or simply shrinking the available dates, the Plan's three alternative options will exclude us from the area above Round Spring during the prettiest seasons and the best fishing months. You want to eliminate even that.

For security we always go upstream from put-in. Last summer while upstream, the outboard starter stopped functioning. The 15 year old and I floated back to Round Spring. If we had been downstream, the return would have required more physical strength than we possess. The Plan will virtually relegate us to launching at the former (Junction Ferry) landing below Jacks Fork.

User Conflict:

In 40 years of using our jonboat, we had only one "conflict". Our jonboat was resting on the south bank approximately 3 miles up from Round Spring. We were quietly fishing one of the best trout holes on planet Earth. A canoeing group appeared and a female canoeist began yelling at us. As she landed on the opposite gravel bar she shouted, "You don't belong here!" She yelled for her canoe-mates to get my boat information. After more hollering, the others in her group asked her to get back in the canoe. They appeared to be embarrassed. She said that she planned to contact a park ranger about us being on the river, in order to assure our arrest. At first my fishing partner and I thought that she was kidding. As she continued, it became apparent that she was serious. After they left, we continued to fish and enjoy the scenery. Except for that episode, we have never been involved in such a situation. She obviously believed that she was one of a select group.

That scene occurred during a sunny Wednesday in June 2011 when we caught (2) large rainbows, (4) nice-sized shadow bass (aka goggleeye), a smallmouth bass, and (2) chain pickerel. This was not an atypical day.

This event is certainly no reason to outlaw anyone off the river. The canoeist's obnoxious behavior did no real harm. 3

Conclusions:

Since we all would not be allowed to benefit, then we all will miss the fishing, boating, and general fun of being in the area. It would be neither fair nor right for only some to continue the experience. It would be selfish.

Among those involved in the Current experience have been our grandchildren of ages 15, 10, and 8. The newest attendee is our 6 years old, water-loving granddaughter. It appears that she will have upper Current only as a fading memory. If the proposed changes become true, all the grandchildren will be robbed of further memories. My mother will miss her fresh fish dinners. I will miss being able to catch them for her. Other handicapped and senior citizens will also be so treated and denied access. In this case the creation of an exclusionary, select group of floaters is neither noble nor just.

A half-century ago with the help of family friend U. S. Representative Richard Ichord in saving it from destruction by dams and other such projects, we assumed that Current River's availability was assured. In spite of that we are now close to loosing the pleasures of the prettiest portion of the arguably most uniquely beautiful stream on Earth. This is more than an inconvenience. The result of banning our usage will be to limit the experience to a privileged class. Our favorite place on Earth, upper Current River, is about to be taken from us.

Having found ways to overcome our handicaps and limitations, this is especially disheartening.

Larry McKinney  
lmckinney@cox.net

On page 61 is a map displaying the "No Action" option which proposes to use existing rules. It describes a 25 hp zone with 10 hp seasonable usage as currently being in effect down to Round Spring. The actual lower boundary is 18 miles upstream at Akers. These 18 miles have no seasonal restrictions. In this zone we are able to use our 25 hp engine all year. I saw no online notation which might either acknowledge reality or correct the error. The existence of this false and misleading information is disturbing.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3035    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** Upon reviewing the draft general Management Plan,I think plan A is by far the best. I have seen too much abuse of the area in question. There needs to be better control of the sensitive habitat to preserve it for generations. Plan A seems to have the best solution of allowing everyone access, yet controlling over use of the area. The streams are some of the best float streams in the country. Motor boats are in conflict with this use. their use must be strictly controlled to avoid damage to the streams and conflict to floaters. I do not float the streams. I am a hiker. I also feel that the floaters and equestrian users are abusing the area. There is too much partying in the streams by both, causing noise, litter and damage to the environment. Plan A still allows all users access to certain parts of the area. It is the best mix of use to control and preserve the area while giving everyone access.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3036    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,19,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** Please leave the current regulation as they are with one suggestion for change. If you eliminate alcohol usage it will eliminate most of the bad "people experiences" of the Park. It would also reduce cost of policing, cleaning and vandalism. Alcohol is not necessary to the use and enjoyment of the Park.

Additional motor boat restrictions are not needed and actual infringe on the native cultural use of the river. The current horsepower limits and size of the river keep speeds down adequately for safety and common courtesy eliminated most conflicts.

Motor boats have long been part of the native cultural use of the river for fishing, gigging sand trapping. I often use the river above Round Springs for this purpose and have many wonderful experiences there with family and friends. We might have to watch the water levels and pull over some sand bars but it is safe and good floating.

Most motor boat use for these activities on the upper river is not during peak tourist season so there is little conflict with other uses.

Motor boats were used on the river long before canoes.

Additional motor restrictions have an economic effect in addition to reducing cultural uses. I would have to drive another 25 miles to use the river with my boat and couldn't even go to Akers to start and see if it is running alright.

Additional restrictions mean less use and less money spent in the area. In this time of government deficits how do you think you will get funding for additional management and development?

One last recommendation. Listen to the natives. They are the ones most effected by regulation changes. It effects our cultural uses and economics. Government is poorly respected already use some common sense and don't make it worse.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3037    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,20,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Ms. Dena Matteson,

I am contacting you to voice support for adopting an updated National Park Service General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I represent no organizations, only myself and several other local folks and visitors from around the area who frequent the ONSR. This letter does not specify a chosen Alternative but rather is intended as general support for a GMP update that allows the NPS to better patrol and preserve the scenic nature of the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers. Many of us will be submitting additional comments and specific suggestions independently.

Missouri 8th District House Representative Jason Smith is encouraging local people to reject all three Alternatives and call for the "No Change Option", charging the NPS with already over-managing and over-burdening local users while still failing at protecting the river environment. While we agree, in general, with his critique of the NPS' poor management legacy, we strongly disagree with his suggestion to reject a GMP update. Many users of the ONSR are displeased with the NPS' management over the past 30 years, but to allow a "No Change" conclusion will simply lead us further down this unacceptable course, and the ONSR will suffer.

The tourism dollars spent by visitors to the ONSR is the economic lifeblood of towns like Salem. If the river ever becomes an undesirable vacation destination, it will dramatically impact the economy of our area. Some residents may associate any kind of new rules or restrictions in the ONSR as a threat to tourism. We disagree, and believe that this update to the GMP is our opportunity and responsibility as people with local interests to insist that the NPS use the GMP update to provide management that broadens the types of visitors we hope to attract to our area. There are many local users of the ONSR who do not approve of the party atmosphere that has evolved on the Current River under the existing 1984 NPS GMP. These types of visitors show little respect for the natural environment of the ONSR or the quality of experience for anyone else on the rivers. The party crowd descends each summer weekend, often scaring off families, fishermen, and others who use the river to connect to the outdoors. They do spend money in the area through canoe and campsite rentals and purchasing alcohol, although most of the alcohol is purchased where they depart, before they ever arrive in the counties bordering the ONSR. This group of users is a minority, and their contribution to our economy is a small sliver of a larger, more diverse economic potential.

We believe that the various zoning distinctions being proposed are sorely needed to offer guidance for the intended uses of the ONSR and to offer increased protection that requires more rigorous planning for future development of the ONSR. We also support the designation of the proposed area near Big Spring as "wilderness" due to the area existing currently as undeveloped land - wilderness in all aspects outside of official designation. The Ozarks, and Missouri in general, have very few options in providing a wilderness experience. Those who seek true undeveloped wilderness in a dramatic landscape are forced to head west to the Rocky Mountains or East to Appalachia. The Big Spring Wilderness can be an attractive alternative to local people and offer a destination to outdoor lovers coming from outside of the Missouri Ozarks.

In response to the concerns of restricted access due to road and trail closures, it's clear that the largest ecological issue that is being addressed by these closures is that of sediment and gravel erosion into the streams. Locals have been aware of the gravel erosion problem for some time, and we would be more willing to accept measures to reduce it if the NPS themselves weren't notorious for circumventing that effort. Locals have a long memory, and events like the spreading of chat gravel on tourist parking lots that lie well below the flood plain are more than enough cause to question the intentions and wisdom of NPS efforts at gravel erosion prevention. Regardless of past erosion prevention failures, we do agree that there are more access points than necessary along the river, and that a great number of these are unmanaged by the NPS and in varying degrees of disrepair. We also understand and agree with the fact that in heavy rain, these roads and traces erode, dumping silt and gravel into streambeds already brimming with gravel. In general, we are in favor of a more detailed study that determines the access points that are the greatest offenders in contributing to the erosion problem, and the subsequent closing and restoration of these areas. When promoting the idea of road closures, it's important for the NPS to understand that this knowledge of the back roads is a point of pride for those who have grown up here. It is also a very valuable method of finding ways to bypass the swarms of outsider tourists that are becoming more and more prevalent in the ONSR. The study of closing these access points should be undertaken with transparency and with open feedback from the local population. A compromise that could be considered by the NPS would be to determine and retain several of the least damaging and most valued secondary roads that are frequented by locals. These should be preserved as truly secondary access points, patrolled and to a degree maintained by the NPS, but not publicized or ever opened up for commercial use.

We support the proposal of a much greater trail network throughout the ONSR. Distinct trails could be established for hiking, horse riding, and mountain biking. We encourage the NPS to reach out to and work in collaboration with other trail establishment advocates around the area. We understand and agree that trails in erosion prone areas and river crossings are a water quality concern, and we agree with the intent to limit the number of these trails and river crossings. However, the long linear nature of the ONSR could provide opportunity for a great mileage of trails that



traverse the ridgelines bordering the ONSR. If these trails were well-planned and well-built this would add a great community value to the ONSR with minimal impact upon the environment.

To conclude, we support thoughtful updates to the GMP that will encourage the NPS to change course and broaden the activities available in the ONSR while still insuring that the river retains a healthy water quality for users and adequate protection for the incredibly diverse animal species that reside there. With increased enforcement of new protection efforts for the rivers, we can rein in the party crowd and attract other user groups. We have the opportunity to help the ONSR become an outdoor destination akin to the other great national parks, attracting visitors from across the nation and world to come and spend their money in our towns and at our pride and joy, Missouri's own national park. With an increase in wilderness areas and the establishment of specified horse, mountain bike, and hiking trails, we will not only attract canoeists and kayakers, but also hikers, cyclists, horse riders, hunters, anglers, backpackers, naturalists, and recreationalists. We can all coexist. Families will again feel comfortable and welcome in the ONSR. They will rent canoes on summer weekends, take winter hikes to visit notable springs and tributaries, experience views of the river from high country trails on horseback. They will rent hotels and bed-and-breakfasts in Salem, Van Buren, or Eminence, and maybe they will even tour a future Montauk museum that presents the history of settlement in the Ozark Riverways and reveals the artifacts and mystery left behind by those who walked these valleys thousands of years ago. Most importantly they will understand the importance of these rivers and why we fiercely defend them.

We encourage the NPS to adopt an update to the GMP that places utmost importance on preserving and protecting the natural environment of the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers.

Respectfully,

John Whitaker - Raleigh, NC (formerly of Salem, MO)

817 821 0230 | johnpwhitaker@gmail.com

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3038	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Nov,15,2013 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	E-mail
-----------------------------	--------

**Correspondence:** I understand that your new draft plan includes more horse trails that run alongside or cross the river and side creeks. This will be very detrimental to the water quality, on which your rare and endangered plant and animal life depend. Please reconsider this expansion of horse trails in this sensitive area. Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3039	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,23,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	E-mail
-----------------------------	--------

**Correspondence:** Dena:

The above web address does not take you to a place where a comment can be left about the planning of what the government wants to do to our Current River. Nothing comes up. I can not leave my comment there because the link does not work.

I am a Carter descendant. Our Current River is in Carter County. We, here in the country, take care of our river. We do NOT want our privileges taken away. Why should people in St. Louis, or anywhere else, have a say in what we are doing with our land & river when we have no say so about their Arch nor do we want to? This is WRONG. NPS is trying to take away our rights to camp on a gravel bar as my family has been doing for a century. They are trying to make it so that we can't boat on our river. This is wrong. We, UNCITY people, don't want to be crammed into a stupid National Park campground when we go camping. We need to retain the right to camp on our gravel bars. ALSO, if you want to make a difference in the quality of the river get rid of the TUBE rental place in Van Buren... it's the trashy drunks coming in from the cities that defile our beloved river. Period.

Please take a look at the link above where we are supposed to be able to leave our comments.

Thank you.

Liz

Van Buren, MO

Carter County- - HOME of the Beautiful Current River

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3040	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Received:</b>	Dec,07,2013 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	E-mail
-----------------------------	--------

**Correspondence:** I am voting no change an why are the horses being discriminated against in this area I pay taxes on horses an now you are tell use were we can ride on the land that the tax payers pay for why are you people always welling to take the rights of the people away with some law that the people doesn't get the right to vote but if I had money you would listen more we don't need to change this if the need more money then tell congress to quit sending money over seas thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3041 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,19,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** I do not believe you should close roads and accesses to gravel bars. The horse power on boat motors should be left alone. Money will be lost from such restrictions from the river. There will be taxes lost for all local counties. I use the river all the way from Two Rivers to Van Buren. This is a way of life for the residents of the area. These are rights that should not be taken away from our generation and future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3042 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,14,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** This project that will make an impact on the waterways and the environmental habitat of the Hellbenders is obviously not sound as has been evidenced by environmental reports. It it totally unnecessary and unneeded and by all accounts it will impact the rivers quality because of uncontrolled pollution of the waterways impacted ! I cannot be at the open house to verbally comment on this project but would give my vote to stop this

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3043 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,15,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** The draft plan for MOSNR is inadequate and in need of significant revision. While it closes some undesignated trails that are damaging the ecosystem, it also authorizes 35 miles of new horse trails with additional river crossings and a new horse campground along Jacks Fork, which will increase water quality degradation. I am especially concerned about its impact on the hellbender. I know that you can devise a better plan, one that protects this remarkable creature and its ecosystem and I urge you to do so.

Sincerely,  
Michael Kutilek, Ph.D.  
Professor emeritus  
Conservation Biology  
San Jose State University

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3044 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,19,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Ozark National Scenic Riverways Proposed Management Plan

The ONSR proposed, 534 page management plan was released for public viewing and comments on the 8th of November 2013. The NPS has allowed a choice of 4 alternatives for the implementation of guidelines for each section of concern.

The 4 alternatives : No Action Alternative Alternative A Alternative B Alternative C

Once implemented the plan will be the structure for managing the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for the next 20 years. The following address contains the proposed plan for your review: [www.parkplanning.nps.gov/ozar](http://www.parkplanning.nps.gov/ozar)

A great deal of explanation and background research is contained in the 534 page plan. The plan has been in the making for several years. I have been a concessionaire with the ONSR as a fly fishing guide for the past 10 years and I have a weekly awareness, as well as a backcountry awareness as to the effects of current usage. I have also been required by the NPS to provide a yearly report concerning my observations of park usage. The yearly reports provided by park concessionaires helped provide information toward the ONSR proposed management plan.

The following are My Personal choices toward the proposed plan:

Motorboat Horsepower (HP) limits B

Federally owned acres within each land based management zone for each action alternative A

River miles within each river based management zone for each action alternative B  
 Cost estimates and staffing for full implementation of the action alternatives B  
 Estimated staffing levels to implement the alternatives B  
 Estimated one-time facility costs to implement the alternatives B  
 Management  
 Concept B  
 Zoning A  
 Visitor Experience B  
 Non-Motorized watercraft code of federal regulation motorboat horsepower limit B  
 Concession floating B  
 Hiking trails B  
 Accessible trails B  
 Mountain bike trails B  
 Horseback riding and camping A  
 Developed camping A  
 Gravel bar access A  
 Gravel bar camping A  
 Backcountry camping A  
 Primitive camping A  
 Caving All alternatives are the same  
 Visitor services and facilities Options need to be clarified as they are not consistent in content A  
 Visitor entry and information All alternatives are the same  
 Additional contact locations B  
 NPS road and river access points A  
 Undesignated NPS roads, traces, crossings and river access B  
 Concessions A  
 Interpretation and education B  
 Natural resource management B  
 Cultural resource management B  
 Historic structures A  
 Cemeteries A  
 Archeological sites A  
 Cultural landscapes A  
 Curatorial facility B  
 Wilderness B  
 Park operations B  
 Partnerships A, B and C are all the same

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3045    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** Draft Management Plan of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways

I am grateful to personally suggest concerns and recommendations to the NPS regarding the Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Superintendent Bill Black stated "Because this is a "Draft" plan, we recognize that there are going to be details we need to adjust or clarify. This is the intent of public review- to help us identify where we need to make those adjustments." Although recreation and public use are important issues for any national park; The citizen volunteer group Greenway Network's mission is to "conserve natural resources, encourage sound management of the watersheds and protect the quality of life for the residences." underlies our prior comments. Greenway's Comment which I gave to the NPS during the public meeting in St. Louis (attached) stated that we preferred Alternate A to best protects the natural resources and watershed. The NPS agreed with that conclusion.

This comment from myself alone. I should first say that Alternative A is also my recommendation. I felt that I should also address some specific concerns under your preferred Alternative B. These comments are not comments from Greenway Network as it would be difficult to get consensus on so many issues presented in the short time remaining for public comment. But, the board may still decide to send a second comment If we are able to have

consensus.

Present damage to the fragile ecosystem is directly resulting from public use and recreation. I now includes some recommendations regarding management practice which need to be adjusted in the NPS recommended Alternate B.

As you are well aware, the fragile, karst ozark uplands require stringent guidelines for public use to both improve and to maintain the watershed's pristine character and its national significance guaranteed for our children's children and beyond. Without such guarantees in place there will be no "public use or recreation" because the watershed will have been degraded to the extent that both tourists will not come and the local related economy will fail.

As you are aware during the public meetings, Politicians and some local residence have pushed for the NPS lands to return to Missouri State control. I am grateful for the NPS presence and are sorry for that insult. The Missouri Legislature has denied funding for the present state parks and would not be able to staff, fund, maintain and operate the properties. We need you! So does this Ozark watershed. The NPS has a history of finding, conserving, preserving, and managing of the lands the late Pete Seeger immortalized; "This land is your land!" I understands and recommends heartily the establishment of a new "Wilderness Designation" it would benefit the very ones who reject it the most. It would bring both regional, national and international tourism and respect for the oldest mountains, most caves and springs and the only free flowing, still healthy stream watershed of the union I might add in jest which is not "blessed" with a dam. My involvement in conservation started with the most amazing and successful push to not build a dam on the Meramec River.

NPS mentioned in the draft plan a desire for increased outreach and networking. I would like to see that some road access points to the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers be used as locations for portable rest room and sinks if required by the health department to reduce nitrate and solid waste loading in the streams and to help the local economy. Perhaps this could be partly or wholly paid for by the NPS to a local provider? Included in this Public Comment is a letter sent prior to Superintendent Mr. Bill Black which outlined this suggestions. Also mentioned was a suggestion to Network with

NPS in the design of a laminate, self sticking notice to be placed on the back of the bus chairs of all the canoe outfitters using the park. This could be something that Greenway Network printed and set up with the outfitters using the park. It could also include a map showing the locations of these portable toilets and give any additional information which NPS may desire. For instance, "no glass bottles permitted or trash removal using the provided mesh bags". Please feel free to call me, Dr. Michael Garvey about these suggestions at your convenience at 636 441 2777.

Below find some personal suggestions to help maintain and improve the water quality and health of the park:

\* The Upper Jacks Fork River from the western boundary to Bay Creek is a most fragile, karst, headstream upland watershed and should be preserved with a zoning designation of "primitive" and not "natural". Many rare and endangered species are found in the upper section of the Jacks Fork River, including:

1. *Campanula rotundifolia* Bluebells of Scotland
2. *Galium boreale* Northern bedstraw
3. *Plantago cordata*...Heartleaf plantain
4. *Cheilanthes lanosa* Hairy lip fern
5. *Goodyera pubescens* Rattlesnake plantain
6. *Cypripedium calceolus* tall yellow ladyslipper
7. *Cypripedium parviflorum* small flowered ladyslipper
8. *Silene regia* Royal catchfly
9. *Aster furcatus* forked aster
10. *Delphinium exaltatum* tall larkspur
11. *Sedum ternatum* Stonecrop
12. *Zigadenus elegans* Mountain deathcamas
13. *Gratiola viscidula* Hedge hyssop
14. *Helenium virginianum* Virginia sneezeweed
15. *Viola pallens* Small white violet
16. *Phlox bifida* Sandphlox
17. *Amsonia ciliata* Ciliate bluestar

18. *Ribes odoratum* Golden current
19. *Berberis Canadensis* American barberry
20. *Matalea oblique* climbing milkweed
21. *Waldsteinia fragarioides* Barren strawberry
22. *Hamamelis virginiana* Eastern witch hazel
23. *Liparis loeselii* Loessel's twayblade
24. *Trillium pusillum* Ozark trillium
25. *Tradescantia longipes* Ozark spiderwort
26. *Trautvetteria caroliniensis* Carolina bugbane
27. *Sullivantia sullivantii* Sullivant's coolwort
28. *Athyrium pycnocarpon* Glade fern
29. *Spiranthes odorata* Ladies tresses

\* The NPS should not expand or upgrade the "Blue Spring Campground" and it should be not be "developed". This karst area with a pristine spring and sinks also contains many rare plant species. This natural resource needs the protection supplied with a designated "resourced-based recreation" not "developed".

\* The Upper Jacks Fork between the western boundary and Bay Creek especially during low flow cannot support any motor boats without damage to the aquatic invertebrates in the gravel substrate and motor oil and gas contamination. The Current River should limit the HP to 40 HP including even jet type motors. These boats disturb the gravels and the oils impairs the streams. A permitting system for the less than 40 HP flat bottom John Boats on the Current River is needed.

\* Horse trails should be relocated wherever possible out of the flood plain areas within the entire Ozark National Scenic Riverways because of the loading, which harms the water quality. There are many miles of "Undesignated Horse Trails" which all need to be "Designated" or removed. All river crossing points of "designated" horse trails needs clearly mapped and reduced in number.

\* The Horse Camps in the Upper Jacks Fork are point source pollution and should be removed especially from the flood plains which are sensitive. There should not be a 25 horse campground at Blue Spring. This is a very bad idea because of the wastes in the flood plain and invasive plants resulting from the hay.

\* A permitting system for the horses on the river is needed.

\* Increased use of non-motorized mountain bikes would both expand the recreational use and not impact the water quality of the rivers. It is a great idea! The users could help NPS to properly maintained the bike trails under NPS oversight. This is done in St. Charles with our County Parks systems.

\* Archery Ranges could be included. Local archery clubs could help set up and maintain them.

\* Disc Golf ranges could be included. Disc golf users or clubs could help set them up and maintain them,

\* Hiking trails are also a great expansion of public use with minimal negative impacts to the watershed. They should be promoted but need patrol and maintenance by the NPS. They should not coincide with the "Designated" horse trails. Local users could help design and maintain them.

\* ATV's are not allowed in the Park grounds. They should not be on the gravel bars, flood plains, horse, hiking or mountain biking trails. They cause excessive erosion.

\* The ATV users now use all trails and horse trails, this issue needs to be addressed with enforcement before any expansion of any possible additional trails or trail systems in the Park are considered. This was a source of many public comments at the public hearings.

\* Motor vehicles and ATV 's do not belong on gravel bars. The oil and gas lowers the water quality and the stream disturbance kills the aquatic invertebrates in the gravel substrate.

\* NPS should be stewards to resist the persistent pressures for mineral prospecting which always then leads to mining and the potential for major degradation of the upland topography and the entire watershed. In the past lead mining tailings has found it's way to springs with disastrous impacts. and adjacent lands within the watersheds

\* Pressure for local gravel mining and use for roads should also be resisted, as it results in a complete change in hydrogeology and alteration of the pristine free flowing, fragile nature of the ozark uplands.

\* Local non-professional archeologists could display their collection "on loan" along with NPS collections at a NPS museum or park office to help educate and network with the public and address the cultural history of the region. All to often these private collection are dispersed after the collector dies and the cultural value of these artifacts and the historic locations they were found are lost.

\* A village archeological site might be researched, documented and possibly the village site could be rebuilt based upon the found remains. It could be done using local residence, students or non professional archeologists under the direct supervision of trained archeologists on staff at NPS.

\* The powder mill needs major protection from flooding damage and the grounds in the flood plain need to be off limits to development. Is their a consideration to use the Mill again for public and cultural benefits?

\* The upland watersheds which feed the water resources of the streams are under the jurisdiction of the MoDNR. There needs to be a point person to work with NPS to address point source pollution and how to address it with the local residence so the stream is not degraded.

\* All failing septic systems need to be repaired on the flood plain.

\* NPS could network with local Government agencies and the local Stream Teams to paint warnings on all Storm Water Sewers Covers in the developed areas of Eminence and Van Buren. Greenway Network is presently working with local governmants in a similar way to paint 6000 sewer covers in St. Charles using local scout groups, residence and students.

\* Perhaps the NPS could work with the local Univ. of Mo. Extension Centers or local garden clubs to discuss ways to address point source contamination reduction using wetlands, native prairies, rain gardens or vegetative swales near loosing streams or sinks.

\* NPS employees and rangers could take the stream Team introductory level testing in Van Buren and set up their own Stream Team to network with the children and public about the importance of issues related to the degradation of the watershed. What a bonding experience for the NPS! Also they could educate the rest of the NPS about the potential to incorporate the Mo. Stream Team concept nation wide.

\* NPS could network with the Stream Team Program and turn the old fishing lodge (Welsh Lodge) into an educational school/camp for the children of Missouri. The Stream Teams locally and the NPS Ozark Stream Team, if created, could use this area as an outdoor educational classroom to teach both the public and the employees of the NPS about the importance of the aquatic invertebrate balance of healthy rivers and water testing to show point source pollution.

\* NPS could network with the St. Louis Zoo to stage areas to incorporate the Hellbender population back to healthy stream sections of the park. Hellbender habitat areas need both protection and new areas need to be added and there needs to be a definite designation of protection for such habitat. The scientific, biologic reason for the species loss needs to be detailed.

\* NPS could consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife and Mo DOC to consider stocking of other aquatic species I.e. Rainbow or Brook Trout if reasonable

\* Bat species are under attack by pesticides, habitat loss and white nose fungus. Many cave openings need protection and possibly gates maintained or installed.

\* Bees also are having stress from pesticide use and loss of diversity of flower types. Local bee keepers could be allowed to place hives on park grounds. Both bees and bats are major pollinators.

\* Locate possible site for a native prairie and possibly work with the Missouri Prairie Foundation or Shaw Garden in St. Louis to recreate a native wetland with wetland plants or native prairie with native grasses and forbs.

Below find the e mail of Jan 24th described above sent to Superintendent

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3046    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Secretary Jewell:

I am writing with regard to the National Parks Service's (NPS) proposed General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, a unit in the NPS created to preserve the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers in Missouri. These spring-fed Ozark rivers have been enjoyed for many years by visitors from throughout the United States, and I support efforts to ensure that they will continue to be enjoyed for decades to come. Proposed Alternative B appears to outline the most reasonable approach to accomplishing this goal, but the NPS must incorporate flexibility into any plan it implements.

Missourians have long supported state parks, and have shown that support by making Missouri one of only four states with a dedicated sales tax to fund parks. With this support, the Missouri state parks system has become one of the top parks systems in the country, winning awards that include Missouri's status as the number one trails state in America. Missourians understand that we hold these valuable resources in trust for future generations, as well as for current use and enjoyment.

It is important to note that without our state's donation of Missouri's first three state parks - Alley Spring, Big Spring and Round Spring - there would be no Ozark National Scenic Riverways. This gift from Missouri to the United States was not universally popular among Missourians then, nor was the process by which lands in the Riverways were acquired. And many of these sentiments remain today, reflected in many of the strong responses to the NPS' proposal. Some of these responses include a call for the transfer of ownership of the Riverways to the State of Missouri. This does not seem the most prudent step in protecting and allowing continued use of the Riverways.

Floating, fishing, hiking, camping, horseback riding, and other such recreation along the Riverways have provided visitors with enjoyable outdoor opportunities. And these activities have a significant positive impact on Missouri's outdoor economy. But some of these activities, in the wrong location or in too heavy a concentration, can pose a threat to the Riverways. Similarly, there are acceptable levels of activity that can accommodate both enjoyment and preservation of these treasures. Alternative B strikes the most appropriate balance between these two, provided that it also contains the flexibility that is necessary and appropriate in managing a resource such as the Riverways.

Missouri is an integral partner in the management and preservation of this area. We have seen significant investment in the protection and enjoyment of the Riverways, both by public and private entities. In recent years, the Missouri State Parks system acquired Current River State Park, an 800-acre park located about two miles from Round Spring. We also last year acquired a new park in the area, a 330-acre tract of land on Sinking Creek, which flows into the Current River a few hundred yards downstream from the new park. Missouri State Parks also manages Roger Pryor Pioneer Backcountry, a 60,000-acre privately owned forest that fronts the Current River for 15 miles and features 30 miles of hiking trails. And Montauk State Park, located at the headwaters of the Current River, is a premier trout fishing destination. There can be little doubt, therefore, as to my interest in ensuring that this area of our country provides the same tremendous outdoor opportunities to our children and grandchildren that it has given to us.

Among the alternatives presented, Alternative B provides the best course for continued and future enjoyment of this treasure, provided that you allow for flexibility to give entities and individuals an opportunity to demonstrate that the activities they propose do not pose a risk to the Riverways.

Sincerely,  
Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon

Governor.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3047    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black:

The Ozark Society sincerely appreciates the hard work you and your staff have invested in developing this proposed GMP. As the organization that led the effort to save the Buffalo River from dams and fostered the establishment of Buffalo National River, we see and directly experience many parallel, even identical issues here that affect ONSR, and we take notice of your proposed actions addressing such issues.

Many members of the Ozark Society including contributors to this comment letter grew up enjoying the Current and Jacks Fork long before ONSR came into existence in 1964. They will testify that the trashed gravel bars and river bottoms and banks dotted with cars, parts, and tires and household trash are now relatively pristine. They will testify bottomland tree stands are very gradually expanding and healing the banks, and shading the stream ever more. They will testify the common practice of watering cattle in the rivers and grazing them on the banks and in woods (free ranging in some areas) has been virtually halted. Many of these welcome great changes are the direct result of NPS management and early citizen advisory guidance in management planning.

However, as visiting recreational use displaced agriculture and local recreational use, huge new problems developed, such as too many visitors in too many places doing inappropriate things. They went unaddressed, indifferently addressed, or incorrectly addressed for decades. This resulted in deteriorating quality of user experience on the water, and resource degradation on the land and to some degree the water, culminating in the Current being declared one of America's Ten Most Endangered streams in May 2011, by American Rivers.

It is our sincere hope that future administrations and politicians will address residual and developing problems in a timely and sufficient manner.

An early settlement description of the Current River is presented in an out of publication book by Leonard Hall, Stars Upstream, 1958, The University of Chicago Press, Library of Congress F472.C9H3 917.788 59-5772. Hall captured oral descriptions from the oldest people he could find then living along the Current River, or what they recalled their elders told them. He also strongly advocated for the establishment of ONSR. Obviously, the Current was far different way back then, but it is and can continue to recover given sound NPS management and enlightened political support.

The Ozark Society vision for ONSR is better described in Alternative A. However, we recognize that correcting the direction of ONSR is best accomplished as a gradual process. For this reason, the Ozark Society generally endorses Alternative B and recommends Friends of the Riverway positions on various nuances with the following modifications, additions or exceptions:

**Scenic Easements:** 9,257 acres are protected by scenic easements intended to ensure the view shed of the visitor remains natural and the waterway is buffered from degrading factors.

Existing violations of easements and encroachments such as cabins, platforms, and pads must be immediately removed and restored to benchmark conditions. Diligent monitoring must be performed to discover and prevent violations. Provisions in the proposed GMP for this minimal administrative function are absent.

**Horses:** Horses invariably have the potential to be of very severe harmful impact because of their physical attributes. All horse facilities such as camps, stables, corrals, loading ramps, parking areas, wash down facilities and the like should be left to private parties outside the boundaries of ONSR. Equestrian trails should be confined to old gravel roads or horse trails designed as horse trails that can be closed to horse traffic due to precipitation or other conditions conducive to erosion or transfer of manure or nutrients to streams.

**Motor Boats:** The imposition of limitations on the operation of motorized boats is necessary and appropriate, but deviation from Federal horsepower regulations in deference to local practice is not appropriate.



Horsepower represents the presumed potential for speed and noise, but it is speed that maims and kills fellow river users while noise irritates and spoils the tranquility. Inappropriate speeds with significant wake motion also accelerates streambank erosion as happened on the Eleven Point River in Missouri. There are now speed limits in place on the Eleven Point to protect riverbanks. The speed, in addition to the horsepower, of motorized craft should be limited by zone and proximity to users wherever they are.

The total prohibition of motorized craft from any zone should be explicitly modified to recognize that exceptions are necessary for retrieval of lodged water craft, reducing the danger of snags, and so forth. If authorized at the discretion of the Park Superintendent, this would allow canoe rental agencies or individuals to recover their property.

Elk/Buffalo, non-native species: Species or sub-species, wild or domestic, not genuinely native as determined by DNA and clear evidence of being or having once been native in the wild should be explicitly prohibited from free ranging presence in the ONSR in addition to a general prohibition. Species such as western elk and plains buffalo, cows, goats, horses and hogs, or Japanese Honeysuckle, fescue, various fungi, python, walking catfish, etc., don't belong in the ONSR.

Native plants should be substituted for non-natives, for example various bluestems or wild rye for tall fescue, wherever feasible. In no case should non-natives be planted, nurtured or allowed to propagate.

Riverbank issues: Regarding the comments of FOR on this issue, we add that movement of streams within the flood plain and streams acting to enlarge the flood plain are natural and ongoing processes. High bank erosion is not solely or always the result of abuse of the stream banks. Bank erosion provably the result of human abuse may be corrected or mitigated utilizing native plants and materials for devices closely mimicking natural mechanisms. If not the clear result of abuse, the natural process should be allowed to proceed.

Feral Hogs: Feral hogs were common before the establishment of ONSR; then they seemed to subside with the end of open range. They are back as "wild boar" now, purposely set loose and hunted, and doing significant resource damage. Wild boar, wild hog, feral hog or whatever the name should be explicitly banned from ONSR so ONSR can more readily justify funding for eradication.

Wilderness: 3, 430 acres of the old Big Spring State Park have been and are proposed to be continued to be managed as de facto wilderness. However, this management or eventual designation as Wilderness should contain explicit provisions for maintaining existing trails and the establishment of additional trails, particularly as part of a linear trail system from Montauk and the Prongs to the southern end of the ONSR.

Hiking Trails: The land along the rivers is underutilized, especially in comparison to the intensity of river use. The proposed addition of 15 or fewer miles of hiking trails is not adequate for the ONSR.

At a minimum, a river length hiking trail system from Montauk to the southern limit of ONSR along the Current, joined by a connecting hiking trail from the Prongs of the Jack's Fork to the Current, should be planned now and explicitly provided for in the proposed GMP ~~â€¢â€¢â€¢~~

It would expand and diversify visitor opportunity to experience ONSR significantly without increasing visitor conflict or degrading the ecology. This trail might be called the Two Rivers Trail in recognition of the traditional name of the historic recreation facility at the junction of the Current and Jack's Fork as well as the synergistic relationship of these two streams.

The route of the "Two Rivers Trail" could coincide with the Ozark Trail in places such as the Powder Mill area.

The TRT and other trails should be permitted to traverse private property of consenting owners who grant easements for this purpose. Obviously, 50 years ago many displaced agrarian landowners granted occupancy easements were in no mood to cooperate even for their own benefit, but times have changed and will continue to improve, so inclusion of planning for a TRT should begin now. For granting private owners, the TRT would enhance property values or benefit the recreation value of such property.

Any GMP alternative must not be permitted or construed to obstruct, limit or negatively affect the OT.

The Ozark Trail and the Ozark Highlands Trail (Arkansas) are in the process of construction toward meeting at the Arkansas border at Lake Norfolk (Tecumseh, MO). This will create a hiking trail from Lake Fort Smith State Park in Arkansas to St. Louis. There are over 300 miles on the ground in Missouri, and 240 miles in Arkansas with 28 under construction along the Buffalo River (BNRJOhn, and more along Lake Norfolk (OHT).

Please contact us if we can assist with additional information or discussion.

Sincerely,

Alice Andrews, Conservation Chair

The Ozark Society

63 Robinwood Drive

Little Rock, AR. 72227

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3048 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Nov,15,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** I have a great love for the Ozarks. I go on vacation there several times a year. Missouri needs to step up into the real world and take care of their wildlife, forests, and their people.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3049 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** NO CHANGE!!! LEAVE THEM THE WAY THE ARE FOR OUR ENJOYMENT!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3050 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,19,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** ONSR enabling act has three stated purposes- conservation, preservation, and recreation. The recreation purpose should not be sacrificed to conservation and preservation. Rather, recreation uses should be widely accommodated. Specifically, I regularly participate in the following recreational uses Atv in some areas as well as camping and boat riding.

These recreations are important to me because I have done them in the same areas for the past 60 years of my life and now I enjoy these recreations with my grandchildren and great grandchildren.

Alternative B unnecessarily restricts/ eliminates my recreational use and use areas. The NPS should explore available amenities that support a wider variety of recreational use which expand motorized vehicle use will accommodate those less fortunate and elderly users who rely on that transportation.

Mixed use river based zones adequately accommodate my recreational use.

It is illogical to place greater restrictive horsepower limits on the River ways upper sections because the water moves too swiftly over the swift areas.

Finally the most disturbing aspects of the draft GMP, the GMP draft process, the NPS, and/ or present ONSR direction is closing of roads, campsites, water access points or sites. Economically there will be tax loss of the local, state, and federal levels effecting all of the community's in the surrounding areas of the purposed plans.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3051 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Re: The Ozark Natl Scenic Riverways. I support Plan B after reading the other options. The area needs

guidelines and I applaud your efforts to protect this beautiful place in MO.

Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3052 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Superintendent Black,

As we have discussed on multiple occasions in-person, I am opposed (individually, and speaking for the overwhelming majority of the 37,000 constituents that I represent) to the National Park Service's (NPS) preferred "Alternative B," and to the further restriction of enjoyment/access for all users. Adoption of the "No Action Alternative," with a priority placed upon enforcement of existing regulations, would continue to protect the natural features of the area, while being the least disruptive to the local culture and economy. I consider the following comments to be separate and substantive, and should you disagree, I would appreciate a detailed explanation which outlines your reasoning.

When the Ozarks National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) was formed in the late 1960's, land was purchased, donated by the State of Missouri, and also taken from private landowners through eminent domain for the purpose of conserving/protecting the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers, natural features, and recreational opportunities for "future generations." Alternative B (NPS Preferred) of the Draft General Management Plan (GMP) directly contradicts the goals set forth when the ONSR was created; through increased restrictions on access and the outright elimination of recreational activities in vast portions along the riverways. Allowing users to responsibly experience this area that we agree is special was the central idea shared by property owners, the State of Missouri, and the PS when the ONSR was created; rather than to create restrictions so that fewer individuals will be able to enjoy this treasure.

It also bears mentioning that the comment/regulation process being used in this instance is severely flawed. Users should not have to comment/advocate to prevent further restrictions from being implemented. Conversely, the burden should fall upon the NPS to justify your proposals to the users; with the final decision resting in the desire and interest of the people we serve.

1. Ironically, the GMP is not "General." Alternative B is very specific in the restrictions that are proposed.
2. When this area was identified as a special area that was worthy of management by a governmental agency, the very river accesses and roads which you now seek to close (or limit to hiking trails) in Alternative B were in existence, and are currently utilized by patrons, park staff, and law enforcement.
3. Current regulations exist to curtail lewd/obscene behavior, horse/vehicle traffic in the river, unsafe/discourteous motorized boat/floater traffic, and littering. Alternative B does not resolve these issues. A visible presence and enforcement of existing regulations is a solution currently at your disposal. At current funding levels, if you are financially unable to enforce current regulations, why would you seek to expand restrictions further? Maintaining a "family friendly" atmosphere should be a priority of any future plans.
4. Closing 2/3 (65 miles) of "undesignated" horse trails will be detrimental to a vital area of our local economy by further limiting the amount of our beautiful scenery that can be enjoyed via horseback.
5. Eliminating motorized use on the upper stretches of the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers is unacceptable. These areas are generally "self limiting" due to the amount of water available, but should remain accessible to users within the current limitations. The use of motorized boats in these areas is not prolific, but is a very important alternative for those with mobility challenges to be able to enjoy the scenery that the upper stretches afford. The use of small john-boats for fishing and gigging is a very significant part of the local culture. The most common use of motorized boats on the upper parts of the rivers are for "river clean-ups," when many tons of trash are hauled out of the rivers by local volunteers (Not NPS employees). I personally know of a number of individuals, that while enjoying the upper stretches, have come to the rescue of someone in a medical emergency. The benefits of motorized use (within the current limitations) far outweigh any problems, and should not be further restricted.
6. Camping along the river on gravel bars should not be limited to "designated areas." Part of the enjoyment of floating/boating is being able to camp at a convenient time and location along your route. Attempting to regulate this is nearly laughable. While the NPS has focused on closing camping areas in recent years, there should be a renewed effort to attract families to visit, camp, and enjoy their stay; rather than to say, "You can't camp here, because it's not designated. "

Your consideration of my comments is appreciated. Should you wish to work together for the betterment of the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers, while jointly preserving the recreational opportunities that many enjoy and numerous families rely upon, I would be happy and willing to assist. This entire situation/discussion revolves around stewardship. The individuals in this area (who live, work and recreate here) have been responsible stewards for generations, in ensuring that the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers are maintained in a pristine state and available for all to visit and enjoy; which is incidentally the same reason that some wanted to designate this as a Scenic Riverway roughly 50 years ago. The question which logically follows: "Is the NPS maintaining the balance of stewardship given to them, through the proposal of the GMP Alternative B?" Sadly, I would say not. If the GMP Alternative B is implemented despite the concerns that have been expressed and the detrimental effects (culturally/economically) which will ensue, I will again state my commitment of "returning the Jack's Fork and Current Rivers to State management," so that the original intent of the founders of the ONSR may be fulfilled; "For the purpose of conserving and interpreting unique scenic and other natural values and objects of historic interest, including preservation of portions of the Current River and the Jack's Fork River in Missouri as free-flowing streams, preservation of springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions (or use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources thereof by the people of the United States .... "

Yours in Service,

Representative Robert Ross  
Proudly Serving the 142nd House District  
Missouri House of Representatives.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3053	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,15,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	E-mail				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Sir/Madam:				

I am concerned that your draft management plan does not go far enough to protection delicate species like the Ozark hellbender. While the new plan does close some undesignted trails that are damaging the local ecosystem, it also authorizes 35 miles of new horse trails with additional river crossings, as well as a new horse campground along Jacks Fork (which the Park Service itself admits would increase the likelihood for water quality degradation).

Please consider tighteneing up the proposed plan to protect threatened species.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3054	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				

**Correspondence:** I am pleased to see that the National Park Service is taking steps to update its General Management Plan

for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The Riverways needs a strong plan to preserve Missouri's world-class freshwater springs, caves, and bluffs that are home to fish, birds, rare and endangered species. As Missouri's largest national park, the Riverways deserve protection for the enjoyment of future generations.

Adverse impacts from unauthorized roads and horse trails, vehicles on gravel bars, and the lack of enforcement against irresponsible behavior are a few of the critical issues facing the health and longevity of the Riverways. A new General Management Plan will address these issues and aid the Park Service in carrying out the Riverways' stated purposes of preservation, conservation and recreation .

The 'No Action' alternative proposed by others is unacceptable because it fails to address the need for enforcement of existing laws and standards, to better manage overcrowding and to improve communication and partnership with local landowners and communities. In many ways, the Riverways are in worse shape than when it was designated a National Park in 1964. The solution to this problem is an updated and stronger General Management Plan, not a transfer to our overburdened state park system. The Riverways and Missourians deserve better.

I support the National Park Service in pursuing a new General Management Plan and its preferred alternative, Alternative B, which would address some of the most critical issues facing the park and the rivers while

promoting opportunities for recreation.  
Thank you,

Sincerely  
Senator Joseph P. Keaveny  
4th District

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3055    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** We are not in favor of closing public access to our parks. This is the peoples' land to enjoy! We ride horses in the Akers Ferry and Cedar Grove area. The money the horse people spend on fuel, trailers, and camping brings a lot of revenue into the state. Horse trails don't negatively impact the environment and the pollution factor- The horses passing through the waters is minimal compared to the wildlife and cattle along the river defecating in it! We just feel like the government is slowly taking away our rights! We want to keep this country FREE!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3056    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent William N. Black  
Ozark National Scenic Riverways

Sir -  
Just think, we could be dealing with the Corps of U.S. Army Engineers instead of your intended organization.

Plan B - Any plan needs to be flexible.

Our goal needs to be to preserve the SOURCE of Current River and keep us from hurting ourselves and others, and not interfere with others' enjoyment.  
Ted Ziske

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3057    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** Dena,  
I could not locate a link to comment on the draft plan for management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and I hope you are the right person to receive my comments and that my comments are not too late for meaningful consideration.  
I reviewed some of the lengthy complex proposals and am grateful that there has been a lot of work that has gone into preparing these options. I am not sure which of the proposed alternatives my comments best support because I support both a high degree of regulation of activities to protect the environment and the old time traditional ways of exploring but also a low presence of law enforcement, which seem to be mutually exclusive as your plans are currently presented. I see both sides of many perspectives because I live on a float stream in Crawford County and have visited Ozark National Scenic Riverways hundreds of times in my life. I also have heard many stories about people's experiences on the rivers in the course of my work.

The two most common problems I have experienced and heard are about the high powered motor boats that disturb primitive users and the environment and the omnipresence of police in the wilderness. I think the Park Service should publicize and implement reward systems such as the Missouri Conservation Department's Operation Game Thief system for citizens who photograph or otherwise document people who are destroying ecological features, littering, using excess horsepower motors, or otherwise causing harms so that they can be civilly sued by citizen activist groups; and focus law enforcement on incidents that involve violence or threats of violence. In order to have public support for such a system, it is necessary that the public be engaged in supporting the policies. The series of recent public presentations about this draft plan could have served this purpose better if there was not such a dominant presence of armed law enforcement officers present. This public impression that the Park Service is

dominated by police control rather than public support is contrary to the environmental purposes of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways because it undermines the depth of public support when policy is presented under the impression of threat of force and criminal penalty rather than through voluntary public cooperation and civil compensation from violators. To the degree the Park Service is willing and able to engage the common citizen in the business of environmental protection through civil suits with rewards for witnesses and litigants there will not have to be the trade-off between the peace that comes from not being disturbed by environmental transgressions and the peace that comes from not living in an overburdening police state.

This libertarian principled approach to proactive citizen environmental protection can also be enhanced through workforce training in non-violent conflict resolution to minimize the need to summon law enforcement for minor problems, expanding the campground host program, authorizing unarmed Park Service employees to write summonses for minor environmental and minor peace disturbance problems, public education about the reasons for regulations, and public education that deterring violence and threats of violence against environmental monitors and other users will be the top law enforcement priority. I realize there is a need for law enforcement to be available to respond to incidents of violence and to provide investigative services for some major crimes, but public support will be increased in proportion to the degree that law enforcement is not involved in minor violations of law or environmental regulation. I encourage you to seek to expand protection of the environment and traditional means of exploration in the most environmentally sound ways possible while utilizing every possible means of reducing the need for armed law enforcement by engaging the public support for Park Service policies.

Sincerely,

/s/Tony Nenner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3058 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** RE: Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan/Wildemess Study/EIS  
Dear Superintendent Black:

On behalf of the Missouri Coalition for the Environment (the Coalition), we submit these comments in response to Ozark National Scenic Riverways' Draft General Management Plan/Wilderness Study, dated October 2013.

The National Park Services (NPS) submitted a Draft General Management Plan (DGMP) for Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) dated October 2013. The DGMP contains three "action alternatives" to address park management issues since the ONSR's last comprehensive planning effort completed in 1984. The DGMP also contains a "No Action" alternative that would leave the NPS' management of ONSR as is and would leave many management issues unaddressed. At the NPS' various hearings on the proposed DGMP, and in the popular press, a number of people and entities have suggested that the NPS simply take no action and continue to operate under the earlier management plan. Taking no action deviates from the NPS' statutory and regulatory directives and is not in accordance with the NPS' own guidance. A new General Management Plan (GMP) is needed and the NPS should move forward with its plans to issue one.

Federal law requires the NPS to file a GMP in a "timely manner" to address changes and provide guidelines for future management of ONSR. See 16 U.S.c, Â§ 1a-7(b). Because the NPS' 1984 planning and management effort for ONSR is outdated, a new GMP must be developed in order to comply with the statutory mandate.

According to section Ja-7(b), a GMP provides guidelines for park management and development including desired resource conditions, user capacity standards, visitor use management, and changes to boundary modifications- and has an expected life of fifteen to twenty years. 1 ONSR's last management effort was conducted over 29 years ago.' ONSR's natural conditions and the park's usage have significantly transformed since the 1984 planning effort. Visitor intensity changes, increased recreational activity, new illegal access points, uses of neighboring property changes, and unresolved legal compliance issues require new management directives that should be addressed by issuance of a new GMP. A new GMP is required to address the current conditions and to provide guidelines for future management of ONSR.

Since the early 1980s, the park has experienced a significant increase in the number of visitors. This requires NPS to revisit the methods by which it achieves its purposes: conservation and interpretation of

the unique scenic values as well as the provisions for use and enjoyment of these resources. See 16 U.S.C. Â§ 460-m. Increased visitor traffic means more stress on the park. These changes must be addressed through a new GMP.

In addition to the increased number of visitors, the ONSR has faced a significant increase in certain types of recreational activity. Since the early 1980s, ATV usage and river activity such as canoeing, floating, tubing, boating, rafting fishing and horseback riding have increased. These recreational activities have brought an increased use of illegal park and river access points, along with overcrowding from an increase in the number and size of motorboats used on its waters.<sup>3</sup> It is the NPS' task to account for these changes in recreational patterns and balance them against the need to conserve the environment. Management cannot rely on an old, outdated planning effort, which was developed before these significant changes, and still accomplish this balancing act. The NPS must take action and adopt a new general management plan as its October 2013 draft envisions.

Moreover, the ONSR has seen an increase in motorboat usage with retrofitted motors in excess of forty horsepower. See 56 FR 30694, July 5, 1991. The regulations to which the ONSR is currently subject do not allow motorboats with more than forty horsepower. See 36 CFR Â§ 7.83(a)(2). The Department of Interior Regional Solicitor's Office has advised the NPS regarding this issue and has determined that retrofitted 60/40 motorboats violate the federal regulation. Despite this known violation, the NPS continues to allow 60/40 motorboat usage on ONSR's waters.<sup>4</sup> A new GMP is needed to address these issues. Continuing management under the "No Action" plan- essentially keeping the earlier management guidelines in place- would continue to violate existing regulations. Id The NPS must either enforce the regulation or make changes to the regulation to accommodate the use of 60/40 horsepower motorboats through an updated management plan.

Thank you for the opportunity to present these comments. If you have any questions about the above or if you would like to discuss the Coalition's comments, please let me know. My contact information is below.

Tony Guan  
Student Attorney, Certified under Rule 13  
Elizabeth J. Hubertz  
Clinic Attorney  
Interdisciplinary Environmental Clinic  
Washington University School of Law  
One Brookings Drive  
Campus Box 1120  
St. Louis, MO 63130

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3059    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,08,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Hi. Are you mailing this? E Mail? I wish to send a notice that my family has spent more vacation time on these waters than any other place in the US. We were always impressed with the quality and tranquility of these waters. We even joined others in picking up any trash (from the canoes it seemed) that happen to be in the water or on the banks. We have also spent many an hour using two vehicles with a trip up stream to access these waters. I have always been blessed with family and/or friends to make this possible. It is a trouble some task.

Please feel free to forward this to any and all that are in the decision process. We have loved, really, loved spending our money and time in your state.

Bill Durham  
Lebanon, Tennessee 37087  
wbill.durham@att.net

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3060    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** None of these are in my area, but this is an issue I'm passionate about. I grew up in the Ozarks and have many family members living in Dent, Shannon, and Reynolds counties. My primary concern with the plan is the effect to local families who have made the commitment to live in and around the Ozarks and its waterways. The lengthy plan includes limited information related to the traditions and heritage of the local people. It seems that once again, a local heritage is at risk of being marginalized to support non-local visitors enjoying the home of someone else.

The people of the Ozarks have a rich and deep heritage of living with the rivers and streams in a symbiotic way. They know and care for their home. I would be in strong opposition to the plan alternatives that weaken the access and use of waterways for the locals. I've spent many afternoons fishing on Current river between Baptist Camp and Akers Ferry. I've gigged Pultite and Round Spring areas. I've floated around Van-Buren. And I hope to take my young sons to these beautiful places as they grow. In all that time, I have seen locals picking up the trash of visitors. I've seen local men standing up for values in the presence of women when others (often drunk) are lewd and disrespectful. I've seen the local men and women take the time to explain the history and ecological significance of a feature on the waterways. The men and women of the Ozarks are among the most hospitable you will meet and they love welcoming visitors into their homeland - and they do so with respect and genuine care. They resist the urge to become unwelcoming to all guests because of the actions of a few.

My concern is that the effects of this plan (particularly Alt B) will result in forcing unnecessary changes on the people who call the Ozarks home. The current regulations - when enforced - create a wonderful experience for locals and guests alike. A respectful local gigger with a 60/40 engine following the existing rules causes no problems for visitors - quite the opposite. I've seen gigging boats used to pick up trash, clean the streams, shuttle guests, and get visitors to safety in the event of an accident or storm. A rude person with little respect for others will cause problems with a motor of any size. The same goes for ATV's, horses, access, campsites, etc. Adding restrictions will hamper the rule-abiding citizens and guests, and those ignoring the existing regulations will continue to ignore the new regulations.

My preference would be Alternative A (no action) with added resources to enforcing current regulations. I believe that adding resources to protecting this beautiful culture and landscape make it an attractive place for families to visit. It is indeed a national and state treasure - but we should always remember that it is also the home to a rich, friendly and viable culture of men and women that love their land and streams. They are one of the most valuable resources in the area - not an obstacle to the vacation of visitors.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3061	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,22,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Other				

**Correspondence:** My husband and I feel that the Park Service has made enough rules for our rivers and lands. I would like the rivers and lands to stay as they are. What good are they if only a few can get to them. Thank you.  
Ralph and Nedria Plowman. Summersville Mo.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3062	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				

**Correspondence:** February 6, 2014

Dear Superintendent Black,

On behalf of our more than 800,000 members and supporters, the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) submits these comments on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (OZAR) Draft General Management Plan (GMP) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

The decisions made in this GMP are critical to the long-term health of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. It is not a stretch to call this a national park in peril. Since 1984, the year the last General Management Plan was completed, lax National Park Service (NPS) management of natural resources and enforcement of laws and regulations, combined with a drastic increase in recreational use on the rivers has caused highly degraded water and destruction of plant life and wildlife habitat.



Congress valued our treasured lands enough to create the National Park Service to manage the national parks on behalf of the American people. When the Organic Act passed in 1916 - legislation that was championed by a Republican from Utah and an Independent from California - the NPS became responsible for conserving the "scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." <sup>1</sup> (emphasis added) This Act clearly points out the responsibility of the National Park Service to conserve the natural resources and maintain balance of conservation with recreation in our national parks.

A series of bills to designate the Riverways were introduced in the early 1960s, but Congressional differences of opinion about the way the rivers should be managed led to the bills' defeat. A united Missouri congressional delegation rewrote the bill with provisions for hunting and fishing, and property owner rights and the bill to establish the Ozark National Scenic Riverways passed. The park's enabling legislation reflects a mandate for balance of preservation and recreation: "...preservation of portions of the Current River and the Jacks Fork River...preservation of springs and caves" and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources."<sup>2</sup>

A park unit's purpose statement focuses the NPS' management role at a particular park and at OZAR that statement calls on the NPS to "preserve and protect in an unimpaired condition" the clean, freeflowing Current and Jacks Fork rivers, springs, caves, and their karst origins" and to "provide for uses and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation opportunities consistent with the preservation of the park unit's resources."<sup>3</sup> (emphasis added) The Ozark purpose statement again reflects the need for balance of preservation and recreation.

The Organic Act remains the strongest mandate for managing national parks, the enabling legislation is the legally binding mandate of the NPS at OZAR and the park's purpose statement is in effect to guide management. But at OZAR, the balance between protecting the natural resources and providing enjoyment through recreation has tipped, jeopardizing the ability of the park to survive for the enjoyment of future generations. Resource preservation and recreational use can be balanced without degrading resources, sacrificing the quality of the visitor experience or negatively impacting the local economy. And it must be balanced at Ozark for the park to survive.

Most of the provisions in the Preferred Alternative B could provide that much-needed balance, but without increased staffing and enforcement of park regulations, the park's natural resources - resources important to people and wildlife alike - will continue to degrade.

## WATER RESOURCES

NPS acknowledgement of managing for clean water:

Ozark National Scenic Riverways contains 134 miles of clear, free-flowing, spring-fed rivers - the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. Protecting the cleanliness of these rivers is central to the mission of the NPS and there is significant evidence in the GMP that underscores that importance. The following four excerpts illustrate that the NPS understands that good water quality is a critical part of their stewardship at OZAR:

"Exceptionally high water quality and clarity of the free-flowing Current and Jacks Fork rivers has led to designation of these rivers as two of only three Outstanding National Resource Waters in Missouri. This designation has national, recreational, and ecological significance."<sup>4</sup> (emphasis added)

"Both rivers are also classified as Tier Three Waters by the State of Missouri. These stringent federal and state standards are designed to protect against any degradation in the water quality of these rivers."<sup>5</sup>(emphasis added)

"The National Riverways' water resources are of exceptional quality; however, they are also highly susceptible to pollution. This is because karst terrain does not allow for effective filtration and absorption of pollutants from surface water as it travels into the groundwater system" <sup>6</sup> (emphasis added)

• Recreation activities also have the potential to threaten the water quality of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways if they are not managed properly. For example, manure from horses and petroleum byproducts from gas-powered motorboats can contaminate river water. In their 2006 study, Davis and Barr reported elevated bacteria levels within the lower Jacks Fork River that exceeded the existing Missouri single sample standard, and was attributed to horses and other land uses<sup>7</sup> (emphasis added)

Collectively, these excerpts reinforce that management practices at the park must be designed to ensure that the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers are clean and clear in order to satisfy state and federal standards. The excerpts also reflect the acknowledgement of the NPS that it is the role of a General Management Plan to provide the path to manage park waters responsibly. These water quality standards are in place to protect human health as well as the well-being of wildlife and plant life. Some actions in the Preferred Alternative B, and certainly the practices currently underway as referenced in the No Action Alternative, are at odds with federal and state standards for clean water:

• Proposed equestrian management would result in new river crossings that would disturb the water, increase erosion and sediment and introduce manure deposits to new areas of the rivers. Although these new crossings would cause pollution in new parts of the river, the net effect of proposed changes to equestrian crossings in the plan may provide overall benefit to water quality. The Preferred Alternative B also says that "Unauthorized crossings would be closed and restored."<sup>8</sup> NPCA supports a limited number of new equestrian crossings in the context of closing and strictly enforcing currently used unauthorized river crossings.

• Establishing a new 25-campsite for horses along the Jacks Fork, as recommended in the Preferred Alternative B, will also introduce new negative impacts to water quality. NPCA recommends locating this campground outside of the national park, which could also provide the added benefit of providing local small business growth for an owner/operator of the campground.

• The Preferred Alternative B will reduce the number of gravel bars accessible by cars and trucks, which will in turn reduce riverbed erosion, sedimentation and turbidity. The No Action Alternative results in far too many cars and trucks parked in the river during peak visitor use. The reduction of gravel bars is critical to implement and enforce as current conditions are not only detrimental to water quality, but also to visitor safety.

• The Preferred Alternative B calls for managing vehicle access points to the river through zoning combined with an increase in law enforcement. This action should halt rather than "reduce the creation and continuation of undesignated roads in the park unit."<sup>9</sup> (emphasis added) There are already dozens of unauthorized roads and access points to the rivers creating negative impacts to water quality, including to rivers, wetlands, streams, and floodplains. NPCA urges the NPS to halt development of new access points, systematically close and restore the unauthorized access points, and enforce the use of authorized access points in order to restore water quality.

#### NPS Management Policies and the Clean Water Act:

NPS's Management Policies set forth specific rules designed to ensure that NPS will manage and perpetuate surface waters and groundwaters as integral components of park ecosystems and these Policies call for compliance with the Clean Water Act. Specifically, the NPS Management Policies say:

The Service will determine the quality of park surface and groundwater resources and avoid, whenever possible, the pollution of park waters by human activities occurring within and outside the parks. The Service will:

• work with appropriate governmental bodies to obtain the highest possible standards available under the Clean Water Act for the protection of park waters;

• take all necessary actions to maintain or restore the quality of surface waters and groundwaters within the parks consistent with the Clean Water Act and all other applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations; and

• enter into agreements with other agencies and governing bodies, as appropriate, to secure

their cooperation in maintaining or restoring the quality of park water resources.<sup>10</sup>(emphasis added)

Importantly, Section 313 of the Clean Water Act requires NPS, in implementing its park management activities, to "...comply with all federal, state, interstate, and local requirements, administrative authority, and process and sanctions respecting the control and abatement of water pollution in the same manner and to the same extent as any non-governmental entity including the payment of reasonable service charges." <sup>11</sup> (emphasis added)

According to the GMP bacteria in the rivers often exceed standards set by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), creating an obvious threat to human health. In conversations with staff at OZAR, there are times the levels of Escherichia coli (E. coli) are very high during peak season in portions of the river with a large number of recreational tubers or floaters. Additionally, according to NPS staff, there are E. coli spikes in areas with high horse traffic. Although the GMP does not specify the number of times annually that the E. coli count in the rivers falls above EPA standards, from conversations and as evidenced by the GMP, it appears to be fairly often: "In locations of high recreational use, bacterial counts can be elevated."<sup>12</sup>

The NPS suggests that to "â€ensure that this standard [to control E. coli] is not violated, the NPS Riverways managers might consider increasing educational efforts to raise awareness of the impacts that river users can have on water quality."<sup>13</sup> (emphasis added)

Since the state of Missouri is responsible for water testing in the rivers at OZAR, NPCA strongly urges the NPS, in cooperation with the state, to develop a communication system to notify people on the rivers that the E. coli count is high enough to risk human health. In the Great Lakes, when E. coli levels are above a set number of colony forming units (cfu) per 100mL, the public beaches are closed and warnings are posted. The EPA has developed a Beach Action Value (BAV) as a tool for notifying beach goers that levels are high. At minimum, the NPS should implement a system for notifying visitors when these levels are high. In addition, the NPS should consider closing portions of the river until levels are within a healthy range. Finally, the NPS should adopt an aggressive education campaign through local outfitters and at authorized river access points to educate visitors about how human body waste must be disposed of while in the park.

Just last year, a Superintendent's Compendium, issued May 20, 2013, reinforces the regulations for disposing of human waste while in national parks:

"Where a toilet facility is not available human waste must be buried at least 6 inches underground and a minimum of 100 feet from any water sourceâ€" <sup>14</sup> (emphasis added)

The laws and regulations governing water quality and disposal of human waste must be enforced because given current conditions, and in the No Action Alternative, visitors are either uneducated about the dangers of E. coli infection or they are content to recreate in a river with high levels of human feces. Either way, if floating the rivers continues to increase, as it has since visitor capacity monitoring was outlined in 1989<sup>15</sup> the NPS will need to address this health risk with education and potential closing of some portions of the river.

As a final note, there is no correspondence in the Appendix indicating that NPS consulted with the EPA regarding impacts on water quality that any of the Alternatives presented in the GMP will have.

NPS, EPA and State of Missouri consultation on plan:

NPS's Natural Resource Reference Manual #77 sets forth a comprehensive set of policy objectives related to water resources management within the National Park System. NPS recognizes that "[m]aintaining water in its natural condition, free of pollutants generated by human activity, is an important goal of NPS managers."<sup>16</sup>

As the Manual observes, states have developed best management practices for a variety of activities

that may be conducted inside or outside of park boundaries and that may contribute nonpoint source pollution, including, among other things, animal waste management and grazing by wildlife and domestic livestock. Specifically, this Manual notes that "[a]ll parks that permit, manage, and/or conduct the above activities, or if any of the activities occur in watersheds that contribute to park water bodies, are encouraged and advised to obtain their respective state's nonpoint source program management plans and incorporate appropriate Best Management Practice into their resource management plans or individual project plans." 17 (emphasis added)

There is no correspondence in the Appendix to indicate that the NPS has consulted with the State of Missouri regarding impacts on water quality that any of the Alternatives presented in the GMP will have. Record of this communication is important because OZAR has Tier Three Outstanding National Resource Waters as defined by the EPA and voluntarily designated by the State of Missouri. Under the Clean Water Act, once the existing uses of a water body have been established by evaluating the water's quality relative to uses already attained the State must maintain the level of water quality that has been identified as being necessary to support those existing uses. In the case of the Current and Jacks Fork, the State of Missouri has committed to the highest (Tier 3) level of anti-degradation for the rivers. Cooperation between the State and the NPS is critical in order to carry out these provisions.

NPS and the Federal Pollution Control Standard:

The Federal Compliance With Pollution Control Standards signed by President Jimmy Carter on October 13, 1978, requires the head of each Executive agency to ensure that all necessary actions are taken to prevent, control, and abate environmental pollution with respect to Federal facilities and Federal activities, and that such agencies comply with all Federal environmental pollution control laws, including, among others, the Clean Water Act.<sup>18</sup>

Among other things, each Executive agency shall cooperate and consult with the EPA Administrator and with State, interstate, and local agencies concerning the best techniques and methods for the prevention, control, and abatement of environmental pollution. <sup>19</sup>

The GMP is not clear to what extent the NPS has consulted with EPA, the State of Missouri, and local governmental units on the impacts that the Preferred Alternative B will have on the rivers' Tier 3 Outstanding National Resource Waters status. The degraded water quality, especially during peak season and especially with the addition of numerous unauthorized river access points and horse trails and crossings, illustrates that there are few measures in place to ensure these regulations and laws governing water quality are enforced. And the GMP in general is very weak in specifying what changes in management need to occur to comply with those laws and regulations.

Water quality and the Endangered Species Act:

Anticipated potential impacts to federally and state-list threatened and endangered aquatic species have been covered in Preferred Alternative B and in the consulting correspondence between NPS and U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) regarding the Ozark hellbender (and two other non-aquatic species). This consultation is done to pursue required compliance with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

The park is known for providing one of the few U.S. habitats for the Ozark hellbender. The GMP acknowledges that not much research exists to assess how NPS management of the rivers affect hellbender habitat, however the GMP cites research from the USFWS and the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) that says "â€degradation of water quality can have considerable negative impacts on hellbender habitat given the hellbender's dependence on clean, clear, and cool river water."<sup>20</sup>

In current practice, and in the No Action Alternative, there are several instances cited above of recreational river uses combined with a history of lax NPS management and enforcement that cause degraded water quality. Equestrian and vehicle access to the river and the pollutants that each introduce are currently causing and would continue to cause adverse impacts to the Ozark

hellbender.

The NPS has analyzed that the Preferred Alternative B would likely provide for an improvement to hellbender habitat, mainly because of changes in resource management strategies. The NPS must continue to consult actively with the USFWS on the health of this fragile and unique wildlife.

#### MOTORBOAT AND NON-MOTORIZED USE:

Generally, NPCA supports the provisions in the Preferred Alternative B for motorized and nonmotorized use of the rivers as described in Table 4 of the Draft GMP/EIS (page 48).

NPCA reinforces that current regulations are mentioned in the GMP: "On waters situated within the boundaries of Ozark National Scenic Riverways, the use of a motorized vessel is limited to a vessel equipped with an outboard motor only."<sup>21</sup> On some portions of the rivers, this is limited to 25 hp and in others it is limited to 40 hp.

In practice, the NPS has not been enforcing the 40 hp for some time, but allowing boats of 60 hp on the river. NPCA understands this allowance - mainly because of powerboat industry changes - and supports the necessary rule-making to allow the 60 hp boats to legally operate in the park.

In addition, NPCA supports the balanced approach to non-motorized zones in the northern Current and Jacks Fork Rivers and seasonal mixed-use. The increase in non-motorized zones provides a beneficial impact to visitors and wildlife alike. The resulting quiet in non-motorized areas will allow the park birds and wildlife to settle. And with nearly 18 million Americans participated in canoeing, kayaking and rafting last year<sup>22</sup> it is important to provide a safe and quality visitor experience for those who want to see the park in a slow and quiet atmosphere.

#### HORSES:

Most negative impacts caused by equestrian traffic that are of concern to NPCA are covered in the comments on Water Resources, but a few provisions in the Preferred Alternative B also bear mentioning.

Critics of the action alternatives have pointed to the reduction of equestrian trail miles and a proposed permitting system for horses as unacceptable. The Preferred Alternative B proposes a system that includes "nearly 60 miles of designated equestrian trails" <sup>23</sup> (emphasis added) and includes about 35 miles of newly designated trails. Because of profound overuse, existing trails will be closed and restored, which is a significant benefit to area equestrian concessioners who rely on a good trail system for their livelihood.

The proposed permitting system would help manage horse levels and impacts on the trail system and park's resources. This permitting system must be implemented or simply put, the park will not exist - even in the condition it is today - for much longer. It is hard to imagine people wanting to pay for a horseback experience along severely rutted trails, crossing a polluted river.

In implementing the permit system and in closing trails for restoration, the NPS must work with local small businesses in order to cause the least disruption in their enterprises. There are many national parks in which trail restoration occurs and in which there are permitting systems that control the numbers of horses on trails at any given time. The NPS may find models within the National Park System on which to base changes at OZAR.

#### LAND-BASED RECREATION:

The Preferred Alternative B calls for mountain biking as a new, allowable use, but only on designated trails. NPCA understands that mountain biking is an increasingly popular activity - especially by an age group that is younger than the typical national park visitor. And although providing this activity is a worthy goal, NPCA fears that there are already a number of management changes in the Preferred Alternative B - horse riding and motor boat use in particular - that will require extra enforcement. This need for extra enforcement on currently allowed activities could preclude

adequate enforcement of mountain biking on designated trails.

The NPS has analyzed potential negative impacts and disturbances to wildlife and plant life as a result of developing trails where there currently are no trails.<sup>24</sup> This potential negative impact could increase if mountain bikes begin forging unauthorized trails through the park.

More importantly, if mountain biking trails are located close to the riverbanks, erosion could degrade water quality further. Finally, without adequate enforcement, unauthorized trails are certain to emerge as well as potential new unauthorized crossings of the river by mountain bikes. For these reasons, NPCA is not supportive of this new use at the park.

#### STAFFING:

The NPS anticipates an additional 26 new Full Time Equivalent (FTE) positions to implement the provisions of the plan, but none of these additional staff members are dedicated to Resource Management.

"The proposed management strategies are not about doing substantially more; but rather are more about managing differently, in a more proactive way that is in accordance with the purpose of the park. Strategies would (also) help restore environmentally degraded park unit lands and facilities."<sup>25</sup>

NPS envisions 8.5 FTEs in the area of Law Enforcement, Safety, and Emergency Services to "help improve protection and monitoring of cultural and natural resources in key areas of the NPS Riverways."<sup>26</sup>

The balance of new FTEs would be primarily for Maintenance and Engineering Division to upgrade visitor facilities projects referenced in the Preferred Alternative B.

NPCA is very sensitive to the underfunded state of our national parks, but additional staff at OZAR is critical. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is a very difficult park to manage and patrol because its boundary runs on either side of 134 river miles. For the last 30 years, management and enforcement of regulations and laws governing water quality and recreation have been lax and none of the Alternatives will be successful without additional staff and new training programs and a system of accountability to ensure that regulations are enforced. Even the No Action Alternative presumes that existing regulations - again, which are currently not being enforced - will be in place. NPCA supports an immediate increase in the staff of Law Enforcement combined with a staff-wide training and accountability program in order to ensure that laws from the Organic Act to the Clean Water Act, and park-specific regulations, are enforced.

#### ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES:

With about 1.3 to 1.5 million visitors each year, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways provides significant economic impact for local communities around the park. Visitor spending is estimated at \$55.5 million with nearly 90 percent of that spent by non-local visitors. The park directly employs more than 125 staff members and leverages 845 jobs outside the park.

The NPS has identified potential opportunities for new concessions based on the action alternatives. The Preferred Alternative B is projected to create new business opportunity for "shuttle services for river users with non-motorized watercraft and overnight river activities such as guided float trips and guided (hike in) back country trips in the natural and primitive zones."<sup>27</sup> There are likely others.

National parks are tremendous economic generators, leveraging at least one dollar in economic activity for every federal dollar invested and the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is no exception. But it will take open minds and entrepreneurial spirits to find those opportunities created by the action in the General Management Plan.

END NOTE:

The NPS calls their charge out clearly throughout the Draft GMP/EIS:

"Congress had charged the National Park Service with managing lands under its stewardship 'in such a means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.' (NPS Organic Act, 16 USC 1)"<sup>28</sup>

NPCA urges the NPS to take their charge to heart because the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is an imperiled national park and will not survive for the enjoyment of future generations without strong NPS management and enforcement of the law.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3063    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** Dena, .

I am writing in regards to the horse trails be recognized. I would just like to say that I thoroughly enjoy riding in the upper ONSR around the Jadwin area. It is very convenient for me to travel to those places on a Friday evening after work since It s usually just me and my daughter. I have been riding for most of my life and have a daughter of my own that I enjoy sharing my love for riding with. I have older family members that enjoy riding this area as well and have rode there for probably 30yrs. We would like to express our concerns on having these trails in this area recognized under your new plan . The area around Eminence is nice as well but we prefer the Jadwin area for it seems to be more family oriented. We have made many great friends through our riding days and would love to be able to continue that in and around the ONSR. We try to ride several times a month during the summer and this area is one we are more drawn to go to for the convenience leaving after work on Fridays. We would love to help and show our support in having these trails recognized in this area.

Thank You,  
Trisha Spaunhorst  
Villa Ridge MO

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3064    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,20,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Although you are not asking people to vote on their choice of alternatives, it is likely you will realize that I am in favor of Alternative A. I feel very strongly that the impact of visitors be minimized or the resource will be degraded too much in my lifetime. I realize they would run me out of town if I made the comment in Van Buren or other towns in the area, but I see no reason for motorized boats in the NP at all, except for law enforcement and emergency. It is a beautiful river to float without the noise of a motor.

The management plan is an impressive piece of work. As a scientist who regularly writes reports and publications, I am in awe at how much work went into the document.

I hope to get my adult children down to enjoy the river this year as I'm afraid it will be lost by the time they are my age.

My comments are in red following sections out of the management plan.

From Page 14:  
Visitor Experience Values

There are few opportunities  
for such high-quality recreation  
experiences in a natural river environment.

To me, the value of this riverway warrants all the protection we can give it. I don't believe that the

local businesses that depend on the river realize that once it is polluted and compromised people will no longer visit and spend their money renting canoes, tubing, fishing in the area. Although a reader might infer it, I did not find this mentioned anywhere in the management plan and I believe it is reasonable to state it clearly.

From Page 18:  
National Park Service Organic Act

The National Park Service and its mandates are authorized under its Organic Act (16 United States Code [USC] 1,2-4) and the General Authorities Act (16 USC 1a-8). These acts direct the agency to conserve the scenery, the natural and historic objects, and the wild life, and to provide for the enjoyment of those resources in such a manner as to leave them unimpaired for future generations.

It seems to me, based on the above paragraph, that the only logical choice would be Alternative A. I realize that most of the local citizens feel that this is "their river" and they should be able to do whatever they want there. I can appreciate that this seems like a massive government intrusion to them. However, the value of this riverway is so great and times have changed- the impact of all the tourism has made changes to the river. Many of these changes have occurred in recent years and the impact has been escalating exponentially. It is no longer just a few people riding their horses or ATVs through the river occasionally. It's many people - every weekend. I did not see this captured and detailed in the management plan.

Amending the Organic Act, the Redwood Act (March 27, 1978, 16 USC 1a-1) further defines that the National Park Service may not allow degradation of the values and purposes for which the various areas were established unless authorized by Congress. This act also affirms that if a conflict occurs between visitor use and protection of resources, the intent of Congress is to favor resource protection.

Once again, it seems to me that the only logical choice would be Alternative A.

From Page 26:  
Visitor Behavior  
Education, interpretation,  
partnerships with special interest groups  
and concessioners, and increased law  
enforcement were suggested as ways to  
reduce conflicts and increase respectful  
behavior.

The only way you can get rid of the drunks is to ban alcohol. Those that would drink responsibly will probably comply, those that don't should leave the river. Unfortunately I can imagine what a huge/impossible job this would be, but you have to start changing the expectations of the floaters so they don't think it has to be a floating drunken party to have fun on the river.

From Page 39:



Alternative B would include several actions, beyond those shared with the other action alternatives:

• Restart oral history program.

• Enhance archive and museum collections program.

• Expand curatorial facility to provide additional archeological storage space for smaller national park units in the region.

• Develop the NPS Riverways as a regional curatorial hub.

• Include monitoring, research, and preservation projects that would actively support and strengthen management capabilities and ensure accurate visitor information.

These are important tasks that should be done. I hope the average person who thinks of a float trip as an excuse to get drunk and disorderly will someday care about this I hope the local people who want us to leave them alone so they can jetboat up the river and do whatever else they want will care about this someday.

Alternative B would include several actions beyond those shared with the other action alternatives:

• Research effects of visitor use on river and karst habitats.

• Partner with the county and state to replace Cedar Grove low-water bridge with a high-water bridge

- Improve park unit waste systems and partner with the community about waste systems adjacent to the riverways.

\_ I never found the reason this was so important. Why? It might be stated in the plan.

• Wouldn't that need to be done under the Organic Act (16 United States Code [USC] 1,2-4) and the General Authorities Act (16 USC 1a-8) anyway?

The three different alternatives each indicate some roads would be restored to their natural condition. I would assume that they would be closed and revegetated. However the plans differ widely on the extent:

Alternative A: "Natural conditions would be restored to approximately 50 miles of roads."

Alternative B: " Natural conditions would be restored to approximately 45 miles of roads, including 10 miles of roads to primitive zone campsites."

Alternative C: " Natural conditions would be restored to approximately 404 miles of roads. (Page 78)

Is this a typo?

From Page 89:

Educate visitors on the importance of protecting the NPS Riverways'

historic properties and leaving them undisturbed for the enjoyment of future visitors.

This was stated with respect to "Historic Structures", "MITIGATION MEASURES COMMON TO THE ACTION

ALTERNATIVES". Throughout U.S. and world history people have destroyed natural resources, historic sites, culturally important sites because:

- they did not know their significance or value (can be overcome by education)
- they did not know how to properly preserve them (can be overcome by education)

The next two cannot be overcome by education:

- they wanted to make a buck and they didn't care about anyone but themselves
- they were unwilling to do the right thing even though they knew better

The last one is very, very difficult to overcome by education:

- since they "lived there all their lives" and treated the important sites any way they wanted, they should be able to continue even though the impact would eventually ruin the sites for everyone.

I personally feel the education efforts of the NPS would be of great value, but many people don't care (see the last three items above) so somehow you have to convince them. We are fortunate that some people have the foresight to preserve some of these resources (e.g., Teddy Roosevelt, when he created the first National Park).

I would hope there are local people who have seen the impact crowds and increased usage has had on the river that you could partner with to educate the local people, that you just can't keep abusing it without eventual ruin.

Until you can convince all the people who use these resources, you have to regulate the impact. There are many places in the country that limit access (e.g., the Boundary Waters in Minnesota) and somehow the outfitters still make a living. It doesn't crash their economy as some has said increased regulations in the National Riverways will. In Yellowstone NP, backcountry camping as well as developed camping are limited and somehow people cope and still enjoy the experience when they can arrange it. Camping and lodging at the bottom of the Grand Canyon is limited and somehow people still enjoy it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3065    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Still searching for "high ground" (final thoughts)

January 13, 2014

In my August 7, 2009 letter to the editor of The Current Wave I expressed the hope that local residents and the park could come together and reach "high ground." Now, four years later, local residents and park officials seem to be standing on opposite sides of the river. To make matters worse, the budget battles from last October and park closures pushed the two parties further apart. If the park is looking for compromise and acceptance from the local community, their timing is poor.

The two opposing sides are now at what appears to be the confluence of two rivers. As a local resident I am hopeful that we can finally accept the park and celebrate the enabling legislation, Public Law 88-492, preserving the Current and Jacks Fork as free flowing rivers. The park is going to do what it has to do "... to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such a manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." However, the park also needs to be grateful and show appreciation for the "crown jewels" in the park that were given to them by the local residents and the state of Missouri. What would the Ozark National Scenic Riverways be without Round Spring, Alley Spring, and Big Spring? It would be reduced to a few primitive campsites along the river. The park also needs to adopt and display an attitude of social responsibility towards the community. Local residents with a passion for the area are allowed to serve as seasonal employees but rarely given serious consideration for permanent positions that include an opportunity to provide input and leadership in the decision making process. In order for any business or organization to be truly successful and accepted they must be socially responsible to the community in which they operate.

I understand that nostalgia is not what it used to be and we have a romantic notion of what life was like before the park was created. However, the riverways was our community and the park has done little to help conserve this tradition. Rather than forming a partnership with local residents, there is a perception that the park has chosen to become occupying invaders of the community. Real or imagined, local residents have a sense of loss and no longer feel they have input or any ownership in the riverways.

Where can we go from here? We have to turn to our rivers to find a solution. The rivers keep running and we will have to keep trying to come together and look for "high ground." Local residents will look for some display of social responsibility from the park. At the same time the park will be looking for some acceptance from the community. I believe we really all have the same goal. Please, let's find our "high ground" and keep going to our rivers for the answers.

Dave Tobey  
Eminence, MO

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3066    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,18,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** The Salem Area Chamber of Commerce requests the comment period for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan Draft be extended an additional 90 days beyond the February 7, 2014 deadline.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways provides tourism experiences that have a significant impact to our economic bottom line similar to Eminence and Shannon Counties. The combined impact of the ONSR on this region is significant. The Current and Jacks Fork rivers have provided jobs and recreational opportunities for our community. We are concerned with unemployment and poverty in our community and are looking at ways to continue and expand opportunities for local employment.

The Salem Chamber appreciates opportunities for our area citizens to comment through the public information and comment meeting scheduled for January 8th and asks you consider providing a similar opportunity to citizens in or near Shannon County. Our natural resources are an important feature in our community and we understand the National Park Service has extended significant effort to develop resource plans to sustain the park system. Our board hopes you look forward with patience and understanding as our local communities attempt to understand and return viable comments on your Draft Plan regarding our future water assets.

Most Sincerely,  
Salem Chamber Board  
The Salem Area Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3067    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Transcript  
**Correspondence:** EMINENCE, MISSOURI 65466

JANUARY 16, 2014

Public meeting transcript

Kari Chilton  
Eminence, Missouri  
No change. That's my comment. Leave it alone. We got enough rules on the river.

Gay Self  
Winona, Missouri  
Well, I just - - you want to know how I feel about it? I feel that I don't think that our area should just be from one organization, that we should have the right to be able to camp where we want to, ride our horses, you know, the Ozark way of life. I don't feel like that it's right that there are people from the cities wanting to tell us what we can and can't do. I think they should vote on the city things. We should vote on the country things. I doubt that they'd like for us to go to the city and tell them where they can and can't camp, where they can and can't ride, or, you know, and so that's just how I feel about it. I'm definitely against it, and I really appreciate you.

Gail Armitage

Eminence, Missouri

Okay. Well, I feel that the people that are from here and live here and their way of life should be honored and that the things that they have done all their life shouldn't be taken away from them, and I feel restrictions are not the way to go because that's what makes this place so popular. And if they start putting restrictions on it and hurting the tourism, not only are they hurting the tourism but they are also hurting the - - well, the money around here. You know what I'm trying to say. They're hurting the businesses. They're hurting everything. They're hurting everybody. So that's my opinion.

Fred Mattison

Summersville, Missouri

I've lived there on the river all my life.

I don't want them to change - - blocking me off from where I can't go up and down it, and I ride horses and gig. And I want to be able to go up and down the river any way I want to. It was the way I was raised.

Sandra Mattison

Summersville, Missouri

I don't want them closing any of the horse trails or the rivers. I don't think they should lose any access to our ground down here. I don't think there's anything that is important enough to shut the public off of our public lands.

Dave Hannigan

Eminence, Missouri

They're talking about closing certain roads and stuff, closing roads, which the access to the park is bad enough already. When I first moved here, we had a little - - a small car, and a little Saturn would not - - could not visit most of the areas of the park, had to have four-wheel drive. As an employee of the park, I made it one of my goals to make every road accessible, as many as I could, make them drivable, but the - - there's still too much of the park that is inaccessible by vehicle that should be, too many of the river access areas even. The roads need to be brought up to the level of county roads as far as safety, and it's a national park. You go to any other national park and the visitor areas are all mostly paved or at least travelable, whatever the right word is to use there. They need to do more for that, and also another main big issue is they promise to maintain the heritage of this area. And all the old grain fields are gone and with it went the quail. There's a lot of habitat that should've been maintained, which, you know, we provide for the birds, rabbits, turkey, deer, elk, et cetera, if those grain fields were reestablished and maintained the way they were originally agreed to be maintained. Another option on that is to maintain food

plots under all the power lines, which need to be cut down anyhow, but when I say, you know, the place needs to be accessible by vehicle, I mean only the roads. The horse trails should be kept up. They're very important to the economy of the area. They're very important to us visiting and enjoying the park, but I still also enjoy the area where nobody can go with a horse or a four-wheeler or a car, you know, places to walk in. And, okay, I'm a hunter. On the plus side just keep up the good relationship with the conservation department, et cetera, which because I feel like they do a great job of supporting the hunters and fishers and photography and everything else that people like to do with having wildlife, abundant wildlife.

Tommy Boyd  
Summersville, Missouri

It's going to be such an economic hardship on folks around here the businesses if they -- if they go with the 20-year plan, and I wish you'd just leave it alone. Let the state take care of it. I don't know how the park service got so much authority down here anyway, but I'm where I'm against it. I'm against it. It's going to hurt this area bad in the long term.

Vanessa Stone  
Eminence, Missouri

I don't want anything -- no obstructions to the horse trails, keep them as is. Do not eliminate the 65 miles or whatever y'all want to do there. I want -- I don't want any authorized horse crossings. I don't think we abuse that, so it's not necessary. Especially no permits for riding our horses. We pay enough in taxes; right? Right. This place is starving, and so I don't want the economy messed up from this for recreational purposes. I know because my husband hires tons of these young guys, and they all look like little hound dogs on the road. They are starving in this area even when they come from good families. They look it, so please don't mess up the little bit of canoe rental jobs that they have and unnecessary -- I hate the when y'all -- what did they do the other day when they closed up everything in the parks? Yeah, the government shuts down shutting down all the bathrooms during the height of trail ride season is ridiculous. Everybody pees in the woods. It's just crazy.

Marium Feutral  
Summersville, Missouri

I've lived here in this community for years. I graduated from here, and I'm disappointed with our rivers that we can't be free to use them as we used to use them, and I'm opposed to all this that's going on.

Glenn Ritter

Bunker, Missouri

On this size limits on the motors and stuff,  
I don't think that - - well, I really don't feel that  
they should tell you what size motor you can run.  
That's already going, but I can live with the way that  
it is. But now their proposition wanting to take where  
we drive in and camp. We camp at Big Bluff all the  
time. That's - - oh, not a park service thing and  
they're wanting to do away with that. I've camped  
there all my life. I don't think it's right that  
anyone should be able to tell you that you can't camp  
there or anything. I don't know - - I don't agree with  
the law. While we're talking about it, on that size on  
the motors, I don't think that's right either. We  
ought to be able to run any size motor that we want to.  
I mean, I've went out of my way to help canoers and  
stuff on the river pull their boats out of the water  
and help people drowning. If it wasn't for our boats  
on the river, canoers would be in a lot of trouble,  
too. Everyone's got to work together. There're good  
and bad on both sides. There's people that abuse it  
and misuse it. I wish everything would just go back to  
just before there was any laws. Just let everybody  
live on it and do fine.

JoAnn Pussehl

Eminence, Missouri

I'm just concerned that this is a rerun of  
the biosphere stuff from years back, and it just seems  
like it's the same thing only a different version.  
That's my comment.

Mildred Elders

Summersville, Missouri

Well, I just think it's beautiful. God made  
it the way he wanted it to be, and we have enough  
concrete around in this world. And I'm afraid that's  
what will happen to our beautiful area if they take it  
over by the park service.

Wanda Shouls

Summersville, Missouri

I just would like for the park service to  
just leave everything like it is.

Suzanne Smith

Eminence, Missouri

I'm worried about the park service taking  
into consideration people who live in Colorado, live in  
California, live in New Jersey their opinion of what  
should be done with the river over the people that live  
here. I have been here off and on since I was born,  
and it doesn't change. The river's still beautiful.  
The river is still nice. The only time I've seen it

abused was by tourists, and I just feel like they ought to consider more of the opinion of the people that live here and that have to make their money on this river, the kayak people, all the people that rent kayaks, everything. I just think it's - - I see what happened around Springs. It just dried up. It's nothing now. I don't want that to happen to Eminence.

Carl Warren  
Akers, Missouri

I want it left alone. I see no reason in changing anything. I was born and raised here. My ancestors homestead is Pulltite, and, you know, I just I don't understand them trying to - - it seems to me like they're constantly trying to take our rights our freedoms away from us.

Curtis Warren  
Salem, Missouri

I've lived here all my life, and when the park come in, they pretty well ruined the place. And that's all I've got to say.

Joe Loyd  
Centerville, Missouri

I guess I have more questions than anything. One of the main questions is I wanted to know what trails - - if they had a specific list of trails/roads that they wanted to close and why they weren't published tonight and if they had any scientific information on horsepower limits showing that a larger horsepower unit created more environmental damage to the environment than a small one and if there was any scientific data that would back up as far as the safety issue on that. I think that's pretty much what I wanted to ask, and I prefer the - - what is the no action plan. Yeah.

Eddie Williams  
Black, Missouri

I just want to say I'd like for them to leave it the way it is, and if they can't take care of it, give it back to the state. We're taxpayers. I feel if we pay taxes on it why are they trying to take it away from us. I don't know if that's the right thing they want. I just know that it seems like they take more taxes, and they just keep taking more and more and more away. And I've got grandsons that's six and ten, and I'd like for them to be able to go when they want to. They love to go gigging. My six year old likes to go gigging. He can't kill a fish, but he tries. And if they start shutting the rivers down, they ain't going to have nothing to look forward to. I'd rather them be fishing or hunting or being on the river than I would be being in drugs and alcohol and stuff, you know. I just think if it's took away it

just takes something away from our youth that's coming up.

Mike Bell

Summersville, Missouri

Now this refers to the alternative plan B on the interpretation education part of the plan. Their there own words here says that self-guided interpretive opportunities would provide visitors with a sense of being the first to discover the remote, hard to find places such as no cabin or secluded spring. Guided opportunities would include ranger-led tours of special features such as old settlements, springs, and river environments. This would be - - this would reach visitors who are looking for a different or additional activities to the traditional float trip, and it goes on and states some other things. And it says down that - - I would like to know how they plan to do that when my ancestors that lived on the river up in the - - on the upper Jacks Fork - - or the lower Jacks Fork I guess you would say being Bay Creek up in that area live there and raised - - there was 13 kids in my grandmother's - - great grandmother's family, and they raised families along the river there and had corn fields and pastures and stuff there. How would they - - how would they be able to show anybody any old settlement there because since they took this over in 1964 it's all grown up in brush. There's no - - I would challenge any park ranger or whoever's going to go down and interrupt anything to anybody down the river to find any old settlement along that river any more because it's all covered in brush since it's grewed up. Now, first off, to do that, they want to give these ranger-led tours. I don't know how big a boat they would have to have because since they don't dredge any gravel out of the river anymore like they used to there's no river there for more than two people in a canoe. They have to get out all the time to drag down. How are they going to do that in a boat in a river that is being filled with gravel since they won't allow any gravel to be taken out of there, and that's in their own plan that they prefer. I just wonder how that would work. That's a statement I want to put them is how they plan on doing it because used to the rivers were grand. They were wide. They were deep. Everybody met on the rivers on the weekends, and everybody picnicked and just had a good time on the rivers with family and stuff. And now, you know, the rivers are so shallow that you have to meet in certain places where there is water, or we can't even have - - can't even swim or anything. The kids can't swim or anything because there's not enough water because of no gravel being taken from the Jacks Fork or the Current River where everybody floats. Now, I do know that they dredge on the upper Current River right at the very head waters. They were dredging up there this last



week. They do that if not every year at least every other year because I work up there. I see it. They do it. They do that because they have to make a place for people to gather at the Montauk Park for the traps because they got to have enough water for them to swim in. Why won't they move that dredging down the river and allow the river to be grand again like it used to be. That might be something they might want to consider looking into, because without it we're just going to have a river of rocks in the next very few years. That's my opinion.

Dale Hampton  
Ellington, Missouri

Well, the comment I got I guess mainly is if they're going to change, you know, what we had going and it's going to really change the way we've used the river for the last 30 or 40 years. I mean, they're starting to close off roads and not allowing people access to gravel bars, and it's been a family thing for us and a lot of other people in this area. And it's something that we don't want to lose. It seems like the government just keeps wanting to put recollections [sic] on the local people, and for what reason I don't know why they're wanting to take away our heritage. And then they show pictures on these billboards of logging and different things that they don't even allow to be done anymore, and those are the comments I got. It's just something we don't want to lose. That's the reason the local people are fighting this so hard.

Doug Warren  
Ellington, Missouri

I know they say they don't want to hear the no action thing. I don't know what else to say other than just give us the no action, you know. Leave us just - - just more law enforcement on the river and keep things the way they are is what we need.

Kenny Wells  
Salem, Missouri

The National Park Service has treated this like a national park when it was legislated by law to be the first scenic riverways in the United States. We were supposed to have had all traditional activities to continue, and public roads were to be maintained. Why did over years did the National Park Service decide to close river accesses that were county roads when it - - its establishment in 1964? In the 1980s the park service decided that trapping would not be allowed because of the word trapping being omitted. Hunting and fishing was allowed, but the word trapping was omitted, not because they wanted the activity omitted but because it was a form of hunting at that particular time. There was a lawsuit filed and a permanent injunction issued against the park service to keep

people. I'm still trapping. If we hadn't have had legislation - - and we tried to talk to people numerous times, and deaf ears were turned toward the local people. Why does the National Park Service take this approach instead of trying to get along with local people? Anything that we do seems to be very much hindered or tried to be stopped.

William Piatt  
Salem, Missouri

They're trying to shut the boats down from Pulltite up, and I've been raised there all my life using that part of the river. And it 's not fair to me for them to shut it down. To me, I've got three boys that use it - - have used it with me as I've raised them, and I say boys. They're men now because they're all but one's in their 20s, and they use it like I do. And if they shut it down from Pulltite up, they're shutting me down. I feel like they're doing - - I feel like they're doing the people in the Ozarks like they done the Indians. They're just forcing us out of here. They want us forced out of here, and I don't know what we can do it about it, but that's the way I feel.

Travis Morrison  
West Plains, Missouri

First of all, several points. First of all, I don't believe it will have any impact, but I want make sure it has no impact on my being able to mine sand and gravel on the watershed that flows into the Current on the upper end. It's not on government land. It's on private land, and we are permitted. And we do everything by the permit. We're inspected regularly, and we have a good reputation. But I would hope that the park service would not do anything that would take that away from us because I can't produce concrete that built this building without sand and gravel that we're getting out of that sand and gravel plot. So that's one thing. I don't think this plan will do anything, and I've been reassured tonight that it will not. Secondly, I know the trail ride issue is a sensitive issue, but it's very important for several families in this region. And I would hope that respect would be paid particularly to the Howell family that has a trail ride on the upper reaches of the park service property up by Acres Ferry and Ceder Grove that they would not be denied the ability to have trails and have their trail ride, because that's the way they feed their children. Okay. The issue on canoes and motor boats I would leave to the folks here that could speak better to that than I could. The closing off of roads I would suggest that that should be - - taking away the ability of local people to access the river by closing roads is - - has a very detrimental effect to people locally, and that may be popular in the urban areas. But these

are the people that live in this community, and taking away that access that they've been using for generations is something that - - that I would argue should be - - should not be done unless there is some very, very compelling reason. Many of the issues that are being looked at regarding this proposal has a lot to do with the impact on local people versus the wishes of people from the urban areas, and the wishes - the local people need people from the urban areas to come down to recreate. That's important to the economy, but the park service should be very, very careful about altering that balance. There may indeed need to be some adjustments, but if it's too much, it takes away the ability of these families to make a living in this region. These towns will - - it's hard enough to make a living here already, and I would urge the park service to be very careful about altering the ability of these communities, the people in these communities to make a living.

Mike Woolsey  
Summersville, Missouri

On plan B and C that propose a bridge across Ceder Grove high bridge my concern is that that is a public access gravel bar and everything. If they build a bridge there like they done paid for the pavement going there that that will limit access if they have another shutdown like they did awhile back we won't be able to put boats in. They will control exits or whatever to the river access. It will no longer be a county access because they won't own on both sides of the road, and the reason that they're doing this they say is because the bridge is obstructing the free flow of the water. If they're worried about that, why are not they getting the gravel out of the creeks and not worrying about the bridge?

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3068	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,22,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				

**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to speak about the proposed Wilderness Area at Big Spring. More importantly, I appreciate the opportunity to speak for the large majority of the people in the 8th District that are opposed to such a proposal and all of the alternatives in the Draft General Management Plan (GMP). Every day, families and businesses in Southern Missouri and all across the Country are under assault from unchecked federal agencies. More and more it seems the federal government is looking for ways to infringe on our property rights and restrict our freedoms. Whether it is crazy proposals to regulate dust on farms, saying kids can't work on their family farms, a National Blueways Designation, or something as ridiculous as requiring a permit to be baptized in a river, the hardworking, law abiding, taxpayers of the 8th district have had ENOUGH..

When congress passed the wilderness act they made it clear that wilderness areas had to be approved by congress. It has been the tradition of Congress to never approve a wilderness area that was not supported by the member(s) whose districts it would be in. Furthermore, wilderness legislation must start in the natural resources committee and specifically on the public lands sub committee on which Jason serves. Let me be clear, Jason Smith and this

Congress will NEVER support a wilderness area within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways nor anywhere else in the state of Missouri. Also, Congressman Smith will fight any attempt by the Park Service to ignore the congressional designation portion of the wilderness act and try to manage lands as if they were wilderness. The elderly, infirm, and disabled veterans and citizens of Southern Missouri deserve to have access to public lands and Jason Smith will not tolerate any attempt by a federal agency to deny that.

Thank you for your time and I urge the National Park Service to reconsider their Draft General Management Plan and allow the people that live and work along the rivers to thrive.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3069    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Transcript

**Correspondence:** CARRIE SPRUELL: I have a question for you. How many of you guys have ever gravel bar camped? If you have, did you like it? If you never had, then why would you want to take it away from us? If you never have, then come down with us and you will see why we love it so much.

Our family, which is very large, have had so many fun memories from weddings, birthdays, anniversaries and just enjoying family fun. Our memories are from family and friends that are no longer with us, memories of ones that are still here and ready for the memories of the new ones joining us in the future. We have had anywhere from 20 to 100-plus people with us on our little piece of heaven down there.

If you really want to improve the scenic riverways, spend the money to hire more rangers to patrol the area. In the last seven years, we have had two rangers come down where we stay and once was whenever there was a drought and just to tell us that there was no fires.

Use the money to inform people how to respect the land and waterways like how we've been taught and how we teach our kids. Leave it cleaner than it was when you get there and if you see trash in the water, pick it up, even if it's not yours.

They've passed laws about like jello shots and beer bongs and others, but I've never seen them enforced very well on other waterways. Concentrate on the trouble areas and on other waterways. That is where your problems are.

We float on many waters, the Current, Huzzah, Courtois, Meramec, Black River and the Current River is the best out of all of them. At the other ones they've seen - - I've only seen three rangers take actions on the water and we usually float at least three times a year and we've been doing it for over 30 years.

So please don't mess with our piece of heaven and use the money to help improve the waterways because I don't want to have to tell stories to my grandkids about all the fun memories we had on Current River that they can enjoy themselves if you don't go through this when they grow up.

I have three kids, 24, 17 and 16, and their favorite time is going down to the Current River. And in today's society with all the technology, with phones, computers, games and when we're there there's none of this available. So you can tell me what that means. We have family time where we can go and have fun and not have any technology to be in our way. And plus, where can you go for 300 bucks a week and have this quality time? It's priceless. So please consider a different decision so we can enjoy the Current forever.

And then also what about the community that's along the riverway? What impact will that have on their living? And maybe you should make rules first and follow them through, instead of trying to take it away from us and try to improve it first.

CONNIE ZIMPFER: I'm asking that you please do not close the access roads to the gravel bars on Current River. We've been going to the gravel bars since I was a teenager and I'm not anymore. Ha-ha. We all go at least once a year. It is a set weekend. Some stay a week or more. Some years we have 60 floaters, some 30. The fact is we go. We use the gravel bars. We love it. We respect the river and all the gravel bars along the way.

As we float down, we see people camping on gravel bars all the way down. So why close them to us? We are here to ask you to please don't take away our gravel bar camping. We really don't understand why you would. Thank you.

ALICE HEZEL: Well, my comment is I don't see anything in there as far as restricting alcoholic beverages on the rivers and my concern is that people - - it will not be a family river. It will become a party area where everybody will be floating down. And when people get into these wilderness areas, they think it's God county, nobody owns it, so they can do whatever they want. And with drinking, there will be the debris, the beer cans, broken beer bottles, you know, people generally then start peeing in the river. Are they going to outlaw cigarette smoking so everybody isn't pitching their cigarette butts in the river and along the way? At least make it be a law so the park rangers can enforce it in case they run across these situations. I think it's been proven that any place where they have alcoholic beverages and smoking and stuff it becomes more of a bar than a wilderness.

You know, I did a lot of floating on the Jacks Fork and the Niangua and, you know, the fun of it was the fact that you were in the wilderness and you got away from all the hustle and bustle of city life and all the traffic.

I know that they're doing something regarding restricting all-terrain vehicles, because all-terrain vehicles and horses in a river going in and out of the river tend to deteriorate the shoreline.

I went on a wilderness float trip in Canada many years ago and they gave you a backpack and you weren't allowed any liquor and they packed the bag, so. And if you wanted to go fishing, they gave you the bait so that you would not bring in foreign bait that was foreign to their lakes and everything up there. So everything was really regulated so that they could protect those lakes. And I think we have to consider doing this also because just past experience tells us how things deteriorate so fast and that you can't make rules after the violation has occurred. That these park rangers need to have the authority to enforce the rules of the road, or the rules of the river. I guess that's about it.

**WILLIAM BRINKHORST:** I was a teacher for 43 years. The school that I worked at had a camp on Sinking Creek which runs into the Current River. When I started going down there, Camp Zoe, which is on Sinking Creek, was the family campground, and then it was bought out and became a place for rock concerts. And I observed what happened to Sinking Creek when trucks and vehicles were allowed on gravel bars.

So my comment is that I would hope that the whatever this is, this process, would keep all-wheel vehicles off of gravel bars. It seems to me that if you want to go down on the gravel bar, you can park on the ground and walk the 30 feet down to the gravel bar just as easily as parking on the gravel bar, because once you allow trucks and cars on the gravel bar, some of them are going to go in. You have to keep them all off.

**DAVID SARTIN:** And my comment is I understand that they want to manage things, but I think they need to consider the way of life of the people that live there, and perhaps give them I guess a more stringent review for allowance of access and allowance of their boats and things like that on the river more so because they live there, and they've lived there forever; rather than to implement change for like allowing bike trails and

things like that. I've lived there a lot of my adult life and I don't see people riding bikes down there quite honestly. So I think their focus needs to be on the people that live there and not for the people who may travel there to use their resource.

ALICE HEZEL: I just wanted to add in addition to the prohibition of booze and cigarettes, that they establish a substantial fine so that it's not just a slap on the wrist, that if the park rangers give them a ticket for having alcohol or cigarette or, you know, throwing their cigarette butts in the river and stuff that there is a substantial fine, that it makes an impact on the people that violated and as an example to future canoeist that they need to obey the rules.

BILL NEUKUM: A no action plan is what I'm after. So not alternative A, B or C. With no action.

LYNN: I think I'm for alternative A because it seems to give more protection to the natural resources. I believe right now there's deterioration of the natural resources, and I believe the other alternatives could actually make it worse. So I think the alternative A is the best.

DAVID HAMILTON: I prefer no action and no change, and the reason I do that, I'm an engineer and I've worked doing county bridges and streams and I know from experience that if you do anything to change the silt boat in that stream, then clean water will run faster, at a higher velocity, than silty water or the condition that presently it is. And I'm opposed to change in the use of this stream supposedly for the argument of removing the silt boat of it because I don't think changing the use will accomplish that. And I see this effort to just trying to remove the people that are presently using it to make it fit other users would prefer.

My other concern is that I work as a county engineer and there are State laws and I've been involved with trying to close roads and was unable to do that because there was a horse trail down an abandoned road and we weren't able to close that road because of that horse trail. I'm a horseback rider. I've been riding on the Current River down there for at least the last 12 years and I just feel like those trails are open to the public

or being used by the public now, whether they're open or not they're being used by the public. And I just don't see how a federal agency can come in and close a trail when a county engineer and a county commission can't close one because it's being used by horseback riders. I don't see how the federal government has more authority to do something that a Missouri county couldn't do.

DAN ARNOLD: I would like to see less restriction put on the areas between Round Spring and Van Buren, and I would like to see none of the access points closed. Would like to be able to camp in the areas that are open now and be able to continue to use the river as we have been in our family for years and years. That's about all I got to say.

GARY BUCHANAN: I would support alternative B. I agree that riverways has areas where large motorized boats should not be allowed. I also support limited canoes put in along the riverways. The current usage is way too heavy in the summer. I do not support spying techniques to try and catch violators whatever they're doing. I believe that all old roads should not be closed. Locals have used river access wherever. Why should the park service tell them where they can use their riverways? Problems on the river are by overusage from floaters more than people using an old logging road to camp. Primitive areas in alternative B should still be able to access without a canoe. All canoe camping should be open along the entire riverways. Sincerely, Gary Buchanan, President of the Shannon County Hunting and Fishing Club. My email is garysharon@buchmail.com. We are also open to being good neighbors and partners with the National Park Service.

KENNY WELLS: I don't want any changes, no roads closed and no motor restrictions. I want to be able to hunt, fish and trap without any restrictions from access.

ARLON HELD: Pretty much the same thing. I like what the alternatives are. I mean, to some of the alternatives I'm like Kenny. I don't see any reason to close all these roads. I'm very concerned about losing my ability to trap because of accesses restricted so much that you can't comment. You



can't get access to areas to do the trapping. You can't trap. You can allow trapping, but if you don't allow access, you're virtually eliminated. You have to have retention of access which can there, in fact, would impact the idea of restricting the motorized boats on river. You can't go up and down the river in a canoe. You can go down, but you can't go up very well. So you can't run a trap line without a motor in certain areas because you can't go back up the river where your vehicle is. So you need some kind of alternative to what they're talking about there.

MARJIE SAITER: My comment: We should not have to vote for someone manipulating us to keep water for necessary business or recreation. Here's what I've seen happen: The most obvious in the last three, four years is 2010 there are two United States Representatives in the San Joaquin Valley of California. They were refused water to save the Smelt Fish. The one who voted for ObamaCare under duress received water for his district. The one who rejected ObamaCare, that land that used to produce great other Mediterranean-type food and, of course, fruits and vegetables, beautiful agricultural land, is from what I understand still cracked dirt, no moisture at all.

Then what's this bit with the flooding?

Why - - was that two years ago - - that Missouri, the breadbasket of the nation, was flooded versus a little town of 600 in Illinois? Now, why was the Illinois - - you know, you know, what President could have anything to do with Illinois? Why was it saved when it was saved in 1993? They should have moved up to higher land as other towns did and use their money once and be done with it. Instead, they were given - - they were saved and farmland, fertile, beautiful farmland in Missouri is under 20 feet of silt sand, cannot be farmed for decades.

So I do not want this manipulative system of having to vote for a person, for me or anyone else to receive water. I want no action, but I said all the other stuff because what they're trying to do is a money laundering system to get money and more bureaucracy, to charge us taxes to pay for stuff that we don't want. Keep the land as it is.

MICHAEL HAMPTON: In response to the Scenic Rivers GOP Draft Plan, my questions that I have is on why are they trying to ban vehicular traffic on non-designated gravel bars? It doesn't say what is a designated or non-designated gravel bar in any of the management plans.

Why are they banning motorized watercraft on 48 percent of the riverways through permanent and seasonal closures? Do they have a baseline of a study that they're trying to do this? Why are they implementing caps for the number of users undertaking certain recreational activities? Examples of watercraft, camper, camping, canoeing, kayaking, etc. Why are they closing 55 miles of vehicular roads and trails?

Why are they closing approximately 20 unidentified river access points? Were they ever deemed unidentified, have they ever been deemed unidentified, that doesn't say. It just says unidentified without any explanation on where they are located.

Why are they closing 65 miles of equestrian trails? In doing that, you're not going to be able to regulate if it's people using the equestrian trails or just simply the wild horses that are already there in the area. So there's no way of knowing if the trails that they're closing they're still going to be used by wild horses instead of people that come in there and ride.

Why are they implementing a permanent system for equestrian users? Why would they single them out to where they have to have permits to ride in there? There again, you still won't know your numbers that are using trails because of the wild horses.

Why are they trying to develop potential permit system for watercraft users and why are they imposing new horsepower restrictions below Big Springs? And I ask this, I mean, is it a speed problem? If so, why not implement a speed limit and lift the horsepower limit off the boats?

I mean, I've canoed from one end of the Jacks Fork to the other and from one end of the Current River to the other and I've never had any kind of trouble while canoeing with boat traffic, especially on high congestive canoeing areas like the upper Current River or the Jacks Fork River. It's never been a issue.

I boat as much as I can all summer long and a lot into the wintertime also and I've never had any kind of conflict with the canoers while I was there or the horse traffic for that matter.

There's never been a problem whatsoever.

If there's any kind of change at all with any of the alternatives, it takes something away from everybody, not just interest groups. What they do is they take a right that we have right now away from certain sections of the river. If you're going to have a plan, it should be blanket over the entire place, not sectioned into out different little spots where you can and can't do things here to where as you can in this spot. It should be open

and left open and left alone.

I go for no action on the whole thing.

The alternatives that they have now will take away boat traffic on each one. They should not take boat traffic away from any of them. They should leave boat traffic alone. They never say anything about taking away the number of canoers concessions that they have and they shouldn't. They should leave the canoers alone, the boaters alone and the horse riders alone. They shouldn't number the number of horses that can be in there.

You know, you don't ever see overuse if you visited every week like I do. You can go down there on a weekly basis and the numbers will change variously during the summer months, but as it gets into the fall and the winter the numbers decline to where there's absolutely nobody over there. If you're after a quiet setting, the weeks and weekends in the summertime that aren't holiday are very quiet. Overpopulated, overuse is not anything of any problem.

The only problem that has really been had is the park service taking away little portions of what they say they're going to do. They've turned water off because they said they couldn't afford to pay to keep the water turned on. They quit having a trash service because they couldn't afford to keep the trash took off the river.

In doing that, it makes the people look bad that go there because they are the ones that have the trash and try to keep it out of there and if not, wildlife can get into your trash and spread it everywhere and make it look bad on you. If somebody were to come down and take pictures after a night that you camped out there and wildlife had got into your trash and drug it everywhere, it looks bad on you. It looks bad on the user and then that's the kind of publicity that we don't need, because the park service has took away all these amenities they said they're going to keep for us and they haven't.

I go for no action, leave it alone, and try to manage what they have already. Put trash service back in, you know, manage it, enforce the rules, enforce the laws and don't change anything.

DARRELL SKILES: I'm Presiding  
Commissioner for Dent County. We own the northernmost portion of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Current River starts in Dent County. First of all, I'm very concerned because all three of the alternatives, A, B and C, further restrict usage of the river by motorboats and access and so forth. The motorboat restrictions particularly on the upper end towards the northern

boundary would totally restrict activities that people in my county have done on the Current River going back to the 1800s, maybe not with motors, but it will eliminate gigging. That is one of the things. The no motors restrictions, no motorized boats restrictions on the upper end of it will basically eliminate gigging.

I have lived in Dent County all my life, I have floated that stretch of the river hundreds of times from the northern boundary all the way to Pultite where these motor restrictions are proposed and never one time have I ever even experienced a motorboat, but I'm floating it and doing it during the summer when most of the canoe floating business is and it's not typically when the - - the gigging season is in the winter. So there really is no conflict that's being addressed by putting this no motor restriction on that section of the river.

And frankly, from what I understand from those friends of mine, people that live in the lower section, these further restrictions on the lower section as well really aren't addressing the problem. That really sometimes will create an even bigger issue because of the longer amount of time it takes to get a boat up on plane with a smaller horsepower motor and the longer it takes to get up on plane, the larger wake that it creates, which creates a greater issue for canoeist and kayakers.

And I'm very disappointed at the format of how the park service has put this proposal together, because by putting it together with the no action alternative and then the alternatives are A, B and C, it's being explained to people to make them think that really their only choices are A, B and C and it's almost geared toward getting a public mandate for broad changes much different than what is currently being used. And I believe these changes find the face of promises that were made in the original enabling legislation in the early 60s that guaranteed traditional uses of the river and those lands would be guaranteed for people.

The same goes for the further restrictions on access to the river and the gravel bars. When they point out in all these plans there are miles of roads and trails that they intend to close and restrict access to. We've asked where are these accesses if they're going to close and nobody can show us. We haven't yet had anybody who could point to one, but it's out there. It's very nebulous. There's no way to find out what the facts are as to what's being proposed.

It's very vague, and to be quite honest, I was at all the meetings that were held earlier over the last, going back two or three years or more to get input from people in the region and what I see it being proposed doesn't even closely resemble

what the people were saying. And frankly, I just don't see where any of these restrictions are coming from and I'm just very, very disappointed in what's going forth.

In regards to the wilderness proposal, I'll address that in this hearing. I'm absolutely opposed to the wilderness designation. There have been eight wilderness areas designated by Congress since 1976 with over 71,000 acres of wilderness just south of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. We have the Eleven Point River going through the Irish Wilderness. That's 16,000 acres of wilderness through the national forest. And again, wilderness designation and management of that subsequent designation, again, would circumvent the enabling legislation guaranteeing traditional uses.

And what we found over the - - let me just add too. What we have found over the last several years is that the park service is not very, let me say, dependable to live up to promises made as to what's going to happen. So I'd be very opposed to it and I know most everybody in my county I believe would be very opposed to the wilderness designation added in with this project.

BILLIE LUTES: I live in Ballwin now, but I'm originally from Summersville, Missouri down around Alley Springs and Current River. And what I would like to know is why are they putting this to the vote to people in St. Louis? They don't know a darn thing about this country down there, the rivers. And when the federal took over the Scenic Riverway, they ruined the rivers down there. They polluted, people throw trash in them, they don't clean them up. It's got to be all wilderness. Well, it's a hell of a wilderness. It ain't pretty. And why should these people that don't know, and I've talked to so many of them - -

DORA RICE: And they never go there.

BILLIE LUTES: No. They don't know anything about it. Yeah, the Sierra Club people, they make it sound like a good thing, but they don't know. Half of them don't even know because they've been listening to somebody else.

I grew up down there and I know what federal did to the rivers and now they want to do it for the ways down there. They can't ride their horses, they can't have a motorboat on the river. Well, why not? They've got these canoes all down the river and if one of them gets in trouble, which happens all the time, who goes after them? Somebody in a motorboat. If they don't let motorboats on the river, those people are going to drown. And anyway, why shouldn't there be?

There's always been motorboats on the river, not big boats. They don't allow big boats. You know that. But people have businesses there, they give people rides on the river. If they don't allow it, then why not? That's their business. Why should they take that away from them?

Why shouldn't people down there that have horses and want to ride, go on trails, why shouldn't they be able to ride horses like they've always done? I mean, people put a lot of money in horses and they have their horses, their trailers.

DORA RICE: They have designated places for the horses.

BILLIE LUTES: And they don't just ride them everywhere, no.

DORA RICE: So I don't understand why they're having such a problem with horses.

BILLIE LUTES: Why they want to shut down all the trails so you can't ride your horse?

You can't go on a trail. And that's how a lot of people's business. I mean, what is it?

DORA RICE: Oh, there in Eminence they have - - I can't remember right now what the name of the club is.

BILLIE LUTES: Big Creek?

DORA RICE: No, it's not Big Creek.

Anyway, they have probably throughout like say through the months April through October, I mean, these people make their living on the trail rides.

That's how they make their living and why should they - - I mean, this is something that's been going on for years and now all of a sudden, you can't have your horses there anymore. That's not right.

That's just not right.

BILLIE LUTES: Well, it's the same with the motorboats. People make their living giving people rides and there's nothing wrong with that. But when the federal government took over the rivers, they don't allow anybody to take gravel out of the river, which they always did before, and that kept the river from getting all clogged up, kept the river running. Now you can't do a good float on the rivers because they're all full of gravel, they're all clogged up.

They don't clean them out and people that ride in the canoes - - not everybody. I don't because I'm from there. If I see a beer can in the river, I pick it up, but who put that beer can there? It wasn't the people who lived on it. It's from the federal. And they don't take care of it and they won't let - - they won't even let you take care of it. They catch you down there cutting weeds, oh, no.

DORA RICE: Oh, you can't cut a weed down. You can't - -

BILLIE LUTES: No, don't do that. It's

got to be wilderness. It's so beautiful. It used to be beautiful. It ain't anymore. I mean, if you could compare it to now to what it was when the State run it and people took care of it, there's no comparison. They ruined the rivers. They ruined a lot and now they don't even want the people down there to be able to go anywhere near it. They won't be able to go and go to the parks or to the rivers, because it will all be federal and you don't have any rights anymore. And there's a law against that, which we can look into. I just found out about it, but there's a law that says you cannot take people's property and not allow them to be there.

DORA RICE: I'm in Union, Missouri. I would like to know why they are wanting to shut down the park at Big Springs. What is the reason for it and what is the advantage of it? It's a beautiful park. Why are they wanting to shut it down to where people can't enjoy it?

I don't know what else to say about it, because I mean, it's a park that people have enjoyed for years and years. It's a nice park. Why all of a sudden do they want to shut it down and make it go back to wilderness? I don't understand that.

It's like they take this - - they take a piece here and they take a piece here and they take a piece over here. Pretty soon there's not going to be any pieces left except what the federal government owns. That is what they're doing and I would just like to know why, because I do not - - there's no reason for it. There's no reason for it.

BILLIE LUTES: And why did they take the turkeys from Missouri and trade them for rattlesnakes? I wish somebody would tell me that.

DORA RICE: I asked the park ranger about that and they didn't know, they knew nothing about no rattlesnakes. And let me tell you, if you camp down there, you will find them because they are there and they put them there and it's a \$1,000 fine if you kill one, and that's a fact.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3070    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Transcript

**Correspondence:** OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS  
DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN  
WILDERNESS HEARING  
PUBLIC COMMENTS  
JANUARY 22, 2014

TIMOTHY GOOD: Good evening. My name is

Tim Good. I've been asked to serve as the facilitator for this evening's wilderness hearing. I consider it an honor to be with you tonight. And I just want to add, I am so impressed with the number of people that have given up their evening to be with us this evening. Unfortunately, I've attended meetings like this in different areas of the country where I could count on one hand the number of people that decided to give up their evenings to attend an event like this. It speaks very well for you, your interest in the community, your park and your country that you're here this evening. To begin I'd like to start with the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America. Please rise and remove your hats.

(The Pledge of Allegiance was conducted.)

As required by law, this evening we are holding a public hearing for the Ozark National Scenic Riverway Draft Wilderness Suitability Study. We are here because of a federal law that was passed in 1964. It was called the Wilderness Act. The act requires that the National Park Service study lands to determine their suitability for wilderness designation.

Of the over 80,000 acres that comprise Ozark National Scenic Riverways, due to the strict criteria for wilderness suitability, the National Park Service found that only 3,430 acres, which is 4 percent of the park, was suitable for wilderness designation. These acres are within the Big Spring wilderness study area.

Now, it's important to understand that this eligibility assessment may lead to the National Park Service director making a proposal to the Secretary of the Interior, who then may make a proposal to the President of the United States and then to the United States Congress. If there's just one thing that I ask you to remember from this evening, is that the power to designate a wilderness area lies with the United States Congress and not with the National Park Service. The power lies with your federally elected representatives and not with unelected federal employees.

Now, currently the area is being managed for wilderness values. If it is designated as

Page 7

wilderness, the fire tower, the incinerator, the barn, the Civilian Conservation Corps camp buildings will remain; however, the National Park Service training range will be removed, administrative use of the roads will be discontinued and they may be repurposed as hiking trails.



Now, there's one person this evening I especially want to point out and I want to ask all of you to give a warm welcome to. It's because of her work tonight the comments that are made here will be preserved not only for the Americans of today, but most importantly, for those Americans yet to come. So please give a warm welcome to the court reporter this evening, Amanda Farrar.

Applause.)

I'd also like to take this opportunity, are there any American Veterans in the audience this evening? Please stand up and give them our gratitude.

(Applause.)

Thank you for your service to our country.

Now, this hearing is being designated for the wilderness area. The National Park Service will only consider comments that are voiced this evening at this time concerning the Wilderness values. This is not a forum to discuss other issues of the General Management Plan or other issues of the park. There's a comment area, there's an online website. Those will be the proper areas to make those comments. And we do ask that you restrict your comments to issues involving the wilderness area.

Now, as far as the procedures for this evening, each person who signed up to speak tonight should have a card with a number. Due to the number of people that have been asked to speak this evening, each person will only have one minute to speak. The gentleman here has a card. When you have 30 seconds left, he'll show you the yellow. When he shows you the red, we ask that you stop speaking and the person at the other microphone may begin.

There were three people in the Ukraine that were killed today because they were at a protest and some other people did not agree with their point of view. I can't emphasize enough that we as Americans have to respect each other's opinions even if we disagree with them. It's easy to sit there and listen to someone's opinion that you agree with. To be an American citizen is to sit there and listen to someone whose opinion you disagree with, but you still give them the opportunity to so.

This goes to our First Amendment, the freedom of speech, the freedom of assembly, the freedom of petition, it goes to the Declaration of American Independence that all men are created equal. So I ask that you respect all the comments that are made this evening whether you agree with them or whether you do not.

I will also ask that you be respectful

of the time you've been allotted. When you're exceed the time, it's telling everybody in the audience that you're more important than everybody else, and ask that you please confine your comments to one minute.

The only other thing I would ask, when you approach the microphone, please state your name, you can also list your place where you live and your affiliation and that's for Amanda's benefit so that she has your name down and this will be part of the permanent record. The comments this evening will also be available on the internet.

JOHN HICKEY: Hello. My name is John Hickey. I'm with the Missouri Sierra Club. I live in St. Louis.

And I'd like to first start off by thanking everyone who's here from the National Park Service and all the rangers who risk their lives to protect us on the river and so I'd like to give a round of applause for the park service.

(Applause.)

And I'd like to thank everybody who came tonight. Whether you came from here or whether you came from far I think we're all here because we all love the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and we all want to see the rivers as good as they can be.

The Sierra Club supports wilderness protection for the Big Spring area. We feel that it is a legitimate wilderness area. It only represents 4 percent of the total acreage of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. It's a very small area, but it is an important area.

I've got two children, a 10-year-old and a 12-year-old. When they grow up, I want to make sure that they have a wilderness area they can go to in Missouri that isn't trashed and full of roads and motorized vehicles. And I think all of us who've got children, who want to see their children see a beautiful Missouri would share my thoughts on that.

I think if you look at the Irish Wilderness Area along the Eleven Point River, we have a great example of a wilderness area along another river in the Ozarks. I think that wilderness area has been a great success over the last 20-odd years. Thanks a lot.

DOUG BROWN: I'd also like to thank the National Park Service for giving us this opportunity to say this. Although, I didn't prepare for a strictly wilderness oriented thing. So this will be short and sweet.

It's my belief that Big Spring wilderness proposal should probably be delayed for

now, but that they should continue to manage the acreage according to wilderness principles until the trends from climate change are better understood and successful protection protocols are identified and can be implemented, rather than put ourselves into a situation where we may not be able to do important management things that have to be done regarding fire prevention and other issues. Thank you.

GREG IFFRIG: Good evening. My name is Greg Iffrig and I work for Pioneer Forest. Our lands are down in the Ozarks along both of the rivers. Worked for them for more than 20 years. I'm here this evening for my family. I've got a wife and two daughters. One of my daughters is here this evening. We've used state parks and the national parks for years. We like to hike. We take other families with us. We take friends of our daughters along. And I remember my first trip to the Big Spring area 30 years ago, climbing the fire tower. That's a place that was bought by the State of Missouri in 1926 as Big Springs State Park. It's been managed as a wildland of back country all the while Missouri had it and then it was transferred to the park service and it's been much the same. That's a 90-year history. It's been well cared for. And my comment is is that we don't change that. We continue to take good care of it, and the management plan is very specific to that effect and I support that. Thank you.  
(Applause.)

RICHARD LaBRASH: My name is Richard LaBrash. I live in Dent County, born and raised there. I am against the wilderness area designation for one reason and one reason only: I don't believe the National Park Service has the expertise, the funding or the staff to manage what they have now. Thank you.  
(Applause.)

LORIN CRANDALL: My name is Lorin Crandall and I am the Clean Water Program Director at the Missouri Coalition for the Environment. I'd like to say thanks to everybody who came up here. I had the opportunity to speak with a lot of people from the area during this open house and I was, you know, very impressed by the amount of local knowledge and care that these people bring with them and brought up here to share with us. I think that, you know, I support the preservation of wilderness. I don't think we have that much wilderness left in

Missouri, in the country even, and so, you know, the plan may achieve that.  
It may have already, like Greg said, been pretty well managed as a wilderness up to now anyways, but I think in a bigger sense what I'm excited about is people having good conversations about how we're going to, you know, take care of the riverway and how we're going to take care of the whole watershed and how we're going to take care of the community down there at the same time and I hope that those conversations continue, because we really have to, you know, overcome some of our differences and have a good, thoughtful narrative around these issues. So thank you.  
(Applause.)

MICHAEL BERG: Hello. My name's Michael Berg. I'm from the City of St. Louis and I support wilderness designation for the Big Spring area. It's been 29 years since any area of Missouri has been designated a wilderness area and I think it's time and this is the only wilderness area in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. So, again, I support designation of wilderness area for Big Spring.  
(Applause.)

DARRELL SKILES: I'm Darrell Skiles. I'm the Presiding Commissioner for Dent County. I live in Salem, Missouri. Born and raised in Dent County. I've lived all my life along the very northern boundary of Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The Current River portion - - actually, Current River starts in Dent County. I adamantly oppose the wilderness designation. Such designation and management of a wilderness area violates the intent of the original enabling legislation creating the Ozark National Scenic Riverways was guaranteeing that all existing and traditional uses would continue. Many may not realize that there have been eight wilderness designations in Missouri since 1976 totaling over 71,000 acres. There are plenty of places for folks to go to have a wilderness experience. So for these reasons and many, many more, which I don't have time to get into tonight, I do strongly oppose this wilderness designation.  
(Applause.)

MICHAEL GARVEY: Hi. I'm Mike Garvey. I'm representing Greenway Network here and I'm also speaking on behalf of myself.

I think the comment about us working together is critical. Greenway Network is primarily a conservation group and wants to maintain pristine waters. And the karst aspect of the spring, Big Springs, is the reason why we're all here and I think what we need to do is understand water quality.

What we do is we do water quality testing, we do stream teams, we get these kids to get in the springs and the invertebrates and it's a real educational experience. The problem is the nitrate loads. The problem with this wilderness area might be related to the lead levels in some of the shooting areas.

A karst environment is very fragile.

The water can go into sinks, it can go into seats, it goes into the stream. The reason that I've been going to these streams for 50 years is because it's a crystal clear water. This is what brings the money into this area, and I think that people that are residents there, the horse people, they need to really appreciate that because that is the primary reason why the National Park Service picked this area to be a national hub. Really a wonderful area. Every time I go down, I see the filamentous algae after we see the cattle and the horse and the contaminants that are getting into the stream and this is where Greenway Network is coming from. We have a comment, but, you know, but I just really appreciate you guys speaking. I really enjoyed the discussions of the stream weathers and how that's impacting these streams.

But these springs are valuable resources. We are the cave state and everything on that water goes into that stream and once those streams are gone, nobody's going to go there and you're taking on a loss that would be great. (Applause.)

JUDY STEWART: Hi, I'm Judy from Eminence, Missouri. I grew up at Akers, Missouri on the Current River. My roots go back to the Civil War in Shannon County. I have a deep love for the Current and the Jacks Fork River.

The intent of the enabling legislation of 1964 had three major provisions that were of equal import, none taking precedent over the other. They were an equal footing. One was not any more important than the other. These provision were: Number one, recreation; number two, conservation; number three, preservation.

This was clearly the intent of the enabling legislation due to the fact that the national monument failed to pass in legislation because it did not preserve the traditional

recreation activities such as hunting, trapping, gigging, etc. When recreation was added, the bill passed, which was the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The general management plan with the rest of the options A, B and C conflict with the intent of the enabling legislation.

The plan for a wilderness doesn't fit anywhere in this puzzle. I propose we go back to square one and follow the enabling legislation. If that fails, then give it back to the State of Missouri.

(Applause.)

BARBARA ANN HUGHES: Good evening. My name is Barbara Ann Hughes. I live in St. Louis, Missouri. I'm here representing myself. First of all, I'd like to thank the National Park Service for supporting wilderness designation for the Big Spring area.

I support the alternative A because of the following, and I'm looking at your own proposal: It talks about creating visitor experiences, providing resource conditions that help visitors better understand the riverways of the past, greater opportunities for traditional non-mechanized forms of recreation and visitor experiences that are quieter, less crowded, and slower paced.

There would also be focus on protecting natural resources and systems, opportunities for historical cultural connections. Emphasis would be placed on restoring national resources to more natural conditions and limiting development. And the example that you give I highly agree is roads and trails that have been illegally developed would be closed and rehabilitated with native vegetation.

I support alternative A and it's my understanding that there have been no new wilderness designated areas in Missouri since 1984 and it's time to protect the Big Spring area. You have my full support for alternative A. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

TERESA DOUGLAS: Hello. My name is Teresa Douglas, and as Missouri residents we have a long history of being the Show-Me State. We value our freedom, our independence and we love our country and our natural environment. In the 90s we fought the biosphere. Now more recently we've had the White River Blueways that the residents of Missouri, southern Missouri had to fight against. That was where the Department of Interior had the Blueway designation which would have limited the water rights and the personal

property rights for 17.8 million acres of Missouri and Arkansas, 21 counties in Missouri. Eighteen counties voted and signed resolutions to say we don't want this in our state and now you come back with this.

The moment we had the Blueways designation taken, here we are. This should not be happening and I'll tell you they have backup plans. They're working on a Mississippi basin study, they've got the Great Lakes, Mississippi River and that will take control of 50 percent of the waterways in the United States.

That's what we're facing if they get this - - if we get this knocked down, they're still going to keep coming at us. I say we forget all of these alternatives and give the land back to the State of Missouri where it belongs.

(Applause.)

STUART KEATING: Hello. My name is Stuart Keating and I represent Environment Missouri with over 13,000 members, supporters and activists as well as Representative Jill Schupp and by proxy the people of House District 88 in the great state of Missouri.

And I am here today, first off, to start a dialogue with people and I want to thank everyone that talked to me out there before the meeting. It was wonderful hearing from you and I feel like I learned a lot and hopefully you did too.

And speaking to the plan, I support the National Park Service's designation of the Big Springs area as wilderness and I think the fact that all three alternatives that are in the plan show significant improvements in park management proves that the National Park Service has listened to not only the community, but the people that live along the river, love the river and the people that need the river to survive for their economic well-being.

If the river is preserved for all users and provides an excellent balance for everyone, the river is going to be a moneymaker for Shannon and Dent Counties. The best way we can do that is finding ways for all of the river users to maximize their enjoyment and I believe that alternative A does that. It closes the most illegal roads, it does the most to allow horse users and boaters to cooperate with each other and live side by side and I think it does the most to protect the river for future generations to enjoy. Thank you.

(Applause.)

THOMAS BALL: My name's Tom Ball and I'm a resident of Webster Groves, but my family's been

in Dent County for about six generations. I'm a descendant of Lewis Dent. And so our family's been going to the Current River for a long, long time and I'm here to speak in support of alternative A. I like the idea of having wilderness designation for the Big Springs area.

I've worked many, many years with Missouri Stream Team 2793 to clean up various portions of the Current River and it's always disturbing to have to go down the river and see the trash that winds up in the river even accidentally from so many people doing what they do. You know, we've had to pull boats out, we've had to pull dead carcasses of deer out that had arrow holes in them and stuff like. Those don't belong in the river. But the wilderness designation, the Wilderness Protection Act of 1974 was one of the best pieces of legislation this country ever had. We've got darn few places that we've actually been able to conserve in the same form that it was when settlers first arrived here. And when we find those areas, it's really important that we try to preserve them and conserve them. If you want to be a conservative, you've got to conserve something. And, in fact, this is an opportunity for us to do that.

I'm thankful that there's so many people here who came out despite the weather and despite the move of this meeting a couple of times. I can tell you I love the river whatever side you're on. Thanks.  
(Applause.)

NANCY HIGGINS: Good evening everyone. I'm Nancy Higgins and I'm a resident of the City of St. Louis and I'm a proud resident of the State of Missouri.

Like so many others here, I've been going to the riverways since I was about nine years old every year and over those years I've met many of the folks who were born and raised down there, taking my friends down and brought our money to those residents and outfitters down there. What I've also seen over the years is a decay of our riverways and what I believe is that there does need to be a more organized management plan that involves everyone.

This course here is lovely this evening and respectful, but I believe that in order to preserve both the economy and the wherewithal for everyone who lives and works down there and to provide for all of the beauty that we get to enjoy when we go down there that we have to preserve and we have to evolve in order to preserve. Thank you very much.



(Applause.)

SUSAN FLADER: Hello. I'm Susan Flader from Columbia, Missouri, representing tonight the Missouri Parks Association. We support the park services preferred alternative B in their management for the Big Spring area.

The National Park Service can't designate a wilderness. Only Congress can designate a wilderness and it doesn't look as though it's going to happen anytime soon and that's okay. What we favor is a continuation of the management that the National Park Service has given to this area from the beginning and that the State gave before that managing it in a way that it is de facto wilderness and we therefore support alternative B. Thank you.

(Applause.)

JOHN FELDMANN: Hi. My name is John Feldmann. I'm from St. Louis. I'm a big supporter of the wilderness act and I love the wilderness areas we already have in Missouri. I'm a big hiker and backpacker and I've hiked and backpacked a number of them in Missouri and around the country too. So I am a big supporter of making another one at Big Springs. Thank you.

(Applause.)

DARREN LINGLE: Good evening everyone. My name is Darren Lingle and I'm honored to be here on behalf of Congressman Jason Smith who represents the counties that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways are in.

I've got prepared statement here that I won't read. I'll submit it for the record though. The Congressman regrets that he can't be here to give those comments himself.

Oddly enough, I agree with something that the first gentleman that lead this off from the Sierra Club said. He said that we all want the riverways to be all that they can be, and I don't think anyone in this room understands and wants what these rivers - - wants these rivers to be all they can be more than the people who live and work on those rivers.

(Applause.)

And that's the people who live - - they welcome people from outside, they need people from outside to come in, float these rivers, enjoy these rivers, but no one is impacted more than the people that raise their families and try to earn a living off these rivers.

Congressman Smith was raised in Dent County on the northern end of these rivers. No one understands it more than him. And I will end by saying this, and I could go on. Again, I'll submit these records and Congressman Smith will submit more in writing before the deadline.

Under the Wilderness Act, no new wilderness designation can be made without the support of the member of Congress that represents that area. Let me be clear: Congressman Smith in this Congress will support no wilderness area in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

(Applause.)

He will support no new wilderness area in the State of Missouri, period, and he will also fight any attempt by the park service or outside groups to manage any areas in a wilderness area that does not fall under their authority.

I thank you all for your time. I'm glad everybody's here. Everybody make sure your voice is heard. Thank you so much.

(Applause.)

CRAIG SCANDRETT-LEATHERMAN: My name is Craig Scandrett-Leatherman. I'm a pastor from St. Louis, Missouri and I love the city and its diversity of people and I love to get out of the city and be renewed by the beauty of God's creation and I especially appreciate wilderness areas where my soul and beauty renew me and so I support the Big Springs wilderness study area.

(Applause.)

CAROLINE PUFALT: Hello. My name is Caroline Pufalt. I'm a resident of University City which is in St. Louis County.

I'd like to support the park service's study analyzing the Big Springs wilderness area and it's recommendation and support the ongoing management that it has exercised in that area for the last several years. I was pleased to be able to say the Pledge of Allegiance at the beginning. It's nice to be able to do that in a large group like this, to hear everyone together.

The phrase liberty and justice for all reminded me of one of my favorite phrases I think is relevant to wilderness by Edward Abbey, that great writer and outdoor adventurer. He says, "What good is freedom without a blank spot on the map?" And that is one of the things wilderness provides, a blank spot where you can be challenged, where you have freedom and you have uncertainty, and I hope we can have a little bit of that freedom and challenge on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MICHAEL WALL: I'm Michael Wall. I teach at a local high school here and for over 25 years I've been leading outdoor trips, river trips in the Ozark Scenic National riverways. I've cut trail there with Greg Iffrig and done other service oriented trips there. My family has owned property on the Meramec River, upper Meramec, in Crawford County for over 50 years.

And I've seen what paddlers can do on the Meramec when they get drunk enough. There was a time when I could lead trips down the Jacks Fork and be secure that we could set up camp without ATVs coming screaming through our campsite. And although I'm naturally inclined to favor wilderness, a wilderness designation, after discussing, pretty heated discussion with people who didn't agree with me other there on the other side of the room, I think one thing we all did agree about was that whatever management plan is endorsed, it really doesn't make much of a difference unless it's enforced.

(Applause.)

And so, you know, I'm not a big fan of motorized traffic on the river, but I have a fond memory of leading a float trip down the Current River and there was a fisherman with a trolling engine set at the appropriate, you know, RPMs fishing along and we were just happy side by side. That was okay. And we've also paddled down the Meramec River and had to have my kids form a tight formation to protect them from jet boats screaming up river full throttle around tight bends. So whatever's happening, I just hope it's enforced.

(Applause.)

TERRI KREITLER: My name is Terri Kreitler and I am from Festus in Jefferson County. I am representing myself, although, I am an elected official also.

My family settled in Dent County in the 1870s, and my great-grandmother sold milk and eggs in Montauk State Park before it was ever a park. She couldn't do that today. And I am talking about the rights of these personal property owners along these rivers and in these wilderness areas and I think we need to remember those are their personal properties.

Over 3,300 acres were taken in the 1960s. How much was taken and how much will be taken? How much more will be taken in the future? So you might want to say 4 percent, that's not much,

but how much was taken then? Thank you very much.  
(Applause.)

RANDY REECE: Hello. My name's Randy Reece. I live in the City of St. Louis. My family's been recreating down in the Ozarks since I was in grade school. I think we've had too much degradation of the riverways. I remember, you know, floating the Current River when people still lived in the stillhouses with no electricity and no running water and there were no motorized vehicles whatsoever, you know, on the water or over on the side of the water. I think the wilderness designation is important for this small area there that's left. Thank you.  
(Applause.)

RICHARD ORR: My name is Richard Orr. I live in St. Charles, Missouri and I work at a place here in Kirkwood called the Alpine Shop where we outfit people to do things in the outdoors ranging from canoeing, hiking, backpacking and we even have some horseback riding equipment. So we cover the whole spectrum. But I would just like to say I support the wilderness designation A that the National Park Service has put out partially because my family has been recreating in the Current River area since 1959, my parents celebrated their honeymoon with a float trip on the Current River in 1959. But my love for that area and the Ozarks in general got me into the outfitting business and I would like to assure a lot of the people on the side of the issue who think wilderness is a bad thing, just to assure them it can be a great economic engine for your community. It's proven itself to be throughout the United States and it's generally a good thing, not a bad thing. Thank you.  
(Applause.)

HELEN GELHOF: My name is Helen Gelhof from St. Louis and I'm here tonight in support of no federal control of our state waterways.  
(Applause.)  
Thank you. We see more and more federal control over everything. The tentacles just keep spreading. We have, all of us, a big respect for the waterways and the wilderness. I think we all love it equally, but the way I see it is it's more of a State issue and should be maintained on a local and a State level.

(Applause.)

And that's really the bottom line. It's the dividing line. Thank you.

(Applause.)

PAUL STUPPRICH: I'm Paul Stupprich and I'm here from St. Louis and I want to thank the park service for all their hard work and for giving us the opportunity to speak for a wilderness. I've been going down to that area since the 1960s and I go into the Ozarks still about four or five times a year and I've hiked in Big Springs area four or five times in the last ten years.

I don't think it's too much to ask to protect 4 percent of the park, or if you think about the whole State of Missouri, it's 44 million acres, and we're going to protect another 3,000 acres. I don't think that's too much to ask. Thank you.

(Applause.)

RICK MANSFIELD: I'm Rick Mansfield with the Ozark Heritage Project. Our stake in this is to try to facilitate a conversation. We're the ones that brought all the jet boats up tonight. We still have several outside. We invite people when this is over to come out and ask any questions, share any concerns.

As to the wilderness area, we're confining our remarks. It's been managed as a wilderness area, as pointed out, de facto since 1920s. I do not believe in these designated wilderness area even though the one upside, there's two sides to every coin, as one gentleman pointed out, the designation might, in fact, create some because some people when they look at the national map, they want to visit the wilderness area. So I can see that point.

Having said that, it seems like it would already be within the park service power, because this is almost to be discussion. If I'd gone first, we could have gone home. The roads and entrances have had gates on them since the 1930s, if not before. The only thing that would change is that designation I just alluded to and I believe the park service could right now decide to no longer use those roads for administrative driving. They could do that within their own executive power. They could decide to remove that one training range.

And so I guess my biggest concern is is Thomas Jefferson reminded people a long time ago that a greater threat to the freedom of the people was not a foreign principality, but an ever increasing government in size. I do applaud the Pledge of Allegiance.

I would ask now that if you wouldn't mind bowing your heads, and those that don't want to participate please in a respectful silence as we go to Lord in prayer for about ten seconds. Thank you. Dear God, we are thankful for the people that risk their lives to protect our rivers and freedom. We're thankful for the men and women that wear the uniform that give us those liberties in so many ways. We ask that as we continue these discussions, not only tonight, for the foreseeable future, that we remember it is your teachings that we can disagree without being disagreeable. We ask for the patience and wisdom to do so. We ask that everybody return home safely tonight. We ask this in your son's name. Amen.  
(Applause.)

STEVEN TOMEY: Good evening. I'm Steven Tomey, teacher at Lindbergh High School here in south county, St. Louis. And thanks for everybody. I've had the pleasure of having about 32 of my students here tonight giving this wonderful experience. And I also am born and raised in Missouri. I'm a lifelong resident. And we're all in this together that I see whether you're St. Louis or down in Eminence where some of my good friends like the Manglers are. I've been down there for 25 years like most of you here. I just three days ago had 25 students in Big Springs. I'm there all the time. I've taken 1,000 students down there because that's where it starts, getting people to care. And I try to teach my students life is a balance and we have to understand that the needs of maybe tourism versus local needs a balance. And I've discussed with my students after this rich experience and we have a consensus of the no change alternative, that right now the government is struggling with enforcing laws that exist. So why produce new needs for enforcement that might not happen anyway?  
(Applause.)  
So that is a consensus of my high school students. Thank you.  
(Applause.)

BRUCE MORRISON: Good evening. My name is Bruce Morrison. I am a resident of Maplewood, Missouri. I'm also a lawyer with Great Rivers Environmental Law Center in St. Louis, but these comments are my own. The law center will be submitting written comments later. We support - - or I support, excuse me. I support the designation of the wilderness area.

It is the wilderness area, it is the wild areas within the park that draws me and my family to the park several times a year. We spend several hundred dollars each time. We support the local community each time and we want to continue to do so. For that reason we want the park to - - we want the park service to preserve the park. The park is slowly dying. The park service needs to adopt an alternative that preserves its precious resource. Thank you.  
(Applause.)

WILLIAM TERRY: My name is William Terry. I wanted to first say it's good to see so many people out who care about the river. You know, everyone here, we all have different opinions, but it's good to see that we care about the river. And, you know, growing up I've lived my whole life on the Current River. There's no place that I would rather be any time of the year. I visit it spring, summer, winter, fall. And with the general management plan as it's currently constructed, I feel it's hard to make an informed decision. The park does not give us the tools to make an informed decision. We don't understand the why of how they developed their management plan. They don't give background data on what is it about. How come they want to restrict access on these areas? You know, the park has laws. You know, people talked about the illegal roads that have been developed, but that's not being enforced and so how will a new management plan enforce these rules that have already been in place? You know, I think everyone here wants to see the park in its best possible fashion. We want to all use the park and utilize it, but it's not currently happening. And so with that said, you know, I support the park and their mission to preserve the resource, but I don't think the alternatives that are laid out currently do that and that's why I want to support the no action plan currently. So thank you.  
(Applause.)

ANDY KNOTT: Good evening. My name is Andy Knott. I live in Shrewsbury, Missouri. I also work at the Sierra Club. The Missouri Sierra Club has 8,500 members throughout Missouri. I want to thank the National Park Service for holding this hearing tonight. I support the designation of Big Spring as a wilderness area. I'm going to talk a little bit about the water

quality benefits of doing so.

I'm a transplant to Missouri. I grew up in southern Indiana, which has its fair share of pristine rivers and geological areas that are karst just like Missouri does, but I actually have fond that Missouri is less many times over my birthplace in terms of these rivers and in terms of these karst areas.

And it's very important to protect karst for water quality. Water quality is really the basis for life and for biodiversity and it is also critical for both our quality of life and for our economy.

So I would urge that the park service move ahead with a designation of the Big Spring area as a wilderness area. Thanks.

(Applause.)

BETTY DENNEY: I am Betty Denney, St. Louis, Missouri, also Stream Team 1546. I believe the highest use of the proposed wilderness area at Big Spring is designation as a wilderness. The description as found in alternate B is the best option.

I believe the trees, the hills, the rocks, minerals and the soil are the raw materials from which our ancestors built the United States. The very character of our country came from the wilderness that was America. There are very few wilderness areas in Missouri and very few acres and this is one of the best examples of what Missouri was like before the 20th century. This is history we are also talking about. Thank you.

(Applause.)

RICH BROWN: Hello. My name is Rich Brown. I'm a citizen of Missouri and a citizen of the United States, and I would like to support the A alternative. I'll try and make this really short.

This parkland and wilderness have been carved out for preservation because of its uniqueness and its pristine character. As a heritage, it belongs to us all and to posterity. I would like to remind everyone that wants to have a fiscally responsible government that it costs far less to protect and preserve than it does to pay for cleanup and restoration. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MARTHA LaFATA: My name is Martha LaFata. I live here in St. Louis County. When I first came to Missouri in 1970, I was introduced to the Current River and absolutely fell in love with



it. It was pristine and not like anything I had ever seen.

I support the designation of the wilderness area and preserving this river and area for all of us to use and enjoy and I support the A. (Applause.)

SARA EDGAR: Hi. My name is Sara Edgar and I'm with the Sierra Club and I'm here to support alternative A and the wilderness area designation. I'm a fifth generation Missourian and my family lived for four generations just one county outside of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. My father believed that Ozark National Scenic Riverways was the crown jewel of Missouri. I really believe the same and I know that everybody in this room is here because they believe the same thing as well. You know, this area is not only significant for all of Missouri, all of the U.S., but it's of international significance and I think it should be protected as such.

I don't think that anyone in this room, especially the people who live in the communities by the parks, should be negatively impacted, but I do think that we all need to work together to find the best way to protect this area so that we can all have clean water, we can have fish that's safe for consumption, we can have economic opportunities for everyone in the state so we can all continue to enjoy this area for future generations and bring our friends and family and people from across our country, from across the world to view this amazing, beautiful site. Thank you so much. (Applause.)

DAN MOSBY: My name is Dan Mosby and I've been using the scenic riverways for over 50 years and I think one thing that needs to be very clear is that over that perspective of 50 years there's been a continuous degradation, dirtying up of our pristine riverways and some plan has to be made to address that. We can't just let it go on. I want to speak to the designation of the Big Springs area as a wilderness area and use an example from Florida to support it. I was just in Wakulla Springs, which is a beautiful area like Big Springs, and it's designated as a wilderness preservation and wildlife preserve and they give tours there where on one side of the line, which is the preservation area, you can go and you can see an amazing variety of fish and you can see alligators, you can see birds and the abundance is astounding. My wife and I thought, well, let's just see the other side of the line and see what that is

like. So the next day after taking this tour, we went and we paddled our canoe along just to the other side of the line. It was beautiful. We saw a normal amount of fish, we saw a normal amount of birds, but it was just a line. On one side of the line people could fish. On the other side they could not. So for just a small area of preservation designation is extremely important.  
(Applause.)

KATHLEEN LOGAN SMITH: Thank you. I can't really add a lot. There's so many people here who've already said what I've been thinking, but my name's Kathleen Logan Smith. I live in St. Louis. I work for the Missouri Coalition for the Environment. We support the wilderness designation. I came tonight with questions about some of the features of the designation and the scope of it and the impact on some of the local residents living in the area because I think it's important that we consider all the inhabitants of the area when we make these decisions. In general, we do support the wilderness designation. We have so little places that are just for nature to live that are not for the rest of us. So I think it's important that we share pieces of this world that have habitat that's set aside for them and we don't have very much of that in Missouri. I also work enough with the State of Missouri and I see enough of the toxic legacy around the state. I see enough of the resource constraints on our State agencies. I know that the Department of Natural Resources and our parks department does not have the resources to sustain Ozark National Scenic Riverways like you and I would want it done and so I can't possible support the idea of giving this resource and this national treasure over to the State government. I know too much about how the State government's activities are constrained right now and some of the limitations that they have. So tonight I want to thank everyone here who's helped inform me and express their love for the riverways and I know that I share that and I want to see what's best for the riverways and I'd like to see this tiny, tiny, minuscule piece of wilderness set aside.  
(Applause.)

ANA GRACE SCHAETNUZU: My name is Ana Grace Schaetnuzu and I'm a member of the Wild Ones Natural Landscapers. We educate people on planting native plants in their yards so that they can recreate wilderness in their own little areas, and

that's my point. I live in St. Louis and I live downstream.  
And everything we do makes a difference.  
And I plant native plants in my yard to help preserve the runoff so it will stop polluting our local streams and hopefully it will keep our local streams cleaner as they go into the Mississippi river. I've seen examples of this all over the country. Another example of wilderness versus not, today in Alaska the EPA released a study about the pebble mine impact on the waterways of Alaska and one of the congressman has decided not to vote for it.  
I just hope that we can remember whether we live in the local area or whether we live downstream that water is life and sometimes the impact of farming and traveling along the edges of the river impacts the water. We just have to preserve it. Thank you.  
(Applause.)

STEVE ROBERTS: Good evening. My name is Steve Roberts. I'm a resident of Reynolds and Shannon County.  
You know, I've heard several comments tonight. One of them is the dying park, continued degradation of the park itself, undesignated roads. All those are issues that need to be addressed because we all agree that the float streams should be preserved.  
Now, if we have a dying park and there's continued degradation of those areas, for example the littering, by the end of summer, we have to get stream teams or people to go by and they pick up the trash. That trash is not - - it doesn't come - - it comes from people that have used - - that's abusing it. So the park service isn't doing their job now. Their rangers aren't enforcing the laws that we have on the books.  
The best way that we can prevent the degradation and the dying park is for them to do the complete jobs, the drugs, the alcohol, the rapes, the assaults, the degradation of the dying of the parks. Closing the accesses for no reasons that aren't really open to us, not giving us an exact number of accesses they're going to close, closing the horse trails down when there's no really evidence of problems.  
We need to look at the big picture here.  
So that's all we're here for. We all love the rivers and we want to keep them pristine and make sure things go right. So thank you.  
(Applause.)

TIMOTHY GOOD: This concludes our wilderness hearing. For exiting we ask that people exit out the fire exits.  
And I just want to make one note. This is one of the best hearings I've ever attended. You were so respectful of the different opinions being voiced and it speaks very well for you as Americans and for our country. Have a good evening.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3071    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Transcript  
**Correspondence:** OPEN HOUSE  
DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN /  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT  
SUMMARY OF KEY EXCERPTS

#### COMMENTS

OPEN HOUSE held on January 17, 2014, between the hours of six o'clock in the afternoon and eight o'clock in the afternoon of that day, at the Salem City Hall Auditorium, 202 North Washington, Salem, Missouri 65560, before Sarah J. Pokorski, a Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public within and for the State of Missouri, regarding the DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT SUMMARY OF KEY EXCERPTS. Taken on behalf of the National Park Service.

(Starting time: 6:00 p.m.)

#### STATEMENT OF DARRELL WYATT

DARRELL WYATT: I came to ask that the Nation Park - - well, first of all, we appreciate what they're doing with this study. It's important. Something needs to be done. And all the people that live on the river and stuff should be glad that it's being done, because of the past. The last twenty years, not enough has been done. But what - - I've come here tonight to ask that they reconsider for Alternative Plan A. It's - - Plan B, I don't feel goes far enough. It's an improvement - - definite improvement, but it doesn't go far enough. If we don't do something now to curb some of the overuse - - abuse and overuse by - - you know, I won't say who, you know, but certain elements, certain groups, then, you know, what - - if we don't do something stronger now, then how are they going to do it later, if needed? And I just feel like this doesn't do enough. Plan B doesn't do enough. And I appreciate them doing it. That's all I have.

## STATEMENT OF RICHARD TYLER

RICHARD TYLER: We need - - don't need no regulations for the boats, period. You know, the river's always controlled the horsepower of the boats and everything. And the main boat owner on the river, that hasn't helped people out. Time was the Park Service wasn't around to help them out. Okay. And I went blank. And if they take the boats away, the elderly and the handicapped, a lot of them will never be able to see part of it. I mean, a lot of them ain't been anyway, but you know, I've took several handicapped and elderly people up and down the river to see different things. If they take the boats away, those elderly people have no way of getting down, because they ain't able to paddle a canoe down the river and stuff. And the Park Service, when they took it 40-some years ago and said we'll leave everything natural, well, they've let all the fields grow up along the river, they've closed the roads that - - where people could get to the river. And then part of their comments, they want to have not such big crowds in one area. But then they close all the roads and the camping spots so the people can't get there, so they've got to go in one area to camp and that. But you know, we don't need no roads or nothing closed. Need to open it up where more people can see what we have. And when the Park Service took the ground what? 40 years ago, they liked what we had then. But ever since then, it's went downhill. I mean, in their management plan here, they have nothing about improvements. It's always taking away, closing it off. There's no improvements to what they can do to improve it, what we have. But like I've told them in the past, we need more restrooms up and down the river. And we have the - - the hellbenders, you know, salamanders, you know, they've disappeared. The fish has disappeared for one reason, so much canoe traffic and people urinating in the water. And there's no deep holes - - there's no deep holes anymore in the river like there used to be, because half the time, a tree falls in, they'll cut it out, because some canoer hollers they couldn't get down the river. They want Six Flags, riding their automatic logs, floating down the river. So they go hollering about the trees in the river, they cut them all out, we have no more deep holes of water like we had 40, 50 years ago. Okay. That's it for right now. I had a whole lot of stuff. I'll get it one of the other places.

## STATEMENT OF GARY LAY:

GARY LAY: I said apparently from the few things I've heard since I come in the door, these issues don't have anything to do with what I thought we were here for. I thought they were trying to stop

the horse riding on the river, and move us away from the river, and I had some comments I wanted to make about that. I've been riding from Baptist Camp access on the Current River to Akers since 1991. And if they want to talk about erosion, the horse trails in the bottom along the river look the same as they did in 1991. There is no erosion on them trails. Now, you get up on the steep hillside and you get away from the river, there is some erosion from the trails and going up the steep hillsides. But on the river, they look the same as they did in '91. If the issue's the E. Coli, the E. Coli is not coming from the horses. It's coming from the two thousand people down there in the canoes. If you think about it, two thousand people down there for two days, every one of them's going to have to go to the bathroom. There's not no bathrooms along the river. If you ride the horse trails, you see the little pile of people feces and the little pile of toilet paper. And I have been told, as bad as this sounds, that some people don't even bother to get out of the river. But so if they're wanting to try to blame the E. Coli on the horses, I don't think that's where the trouble's coming from. As far as economic impact, I realize that the horse riders are out-numbered by the canoer, badly. On any given day down there, you'll see a hundred horse riders and two thousand canoers. If they want to say that the horse riders are not contributing enough money into the economy, they need to rethink that, because like I said, I've been riding since '91, and I meet a lot of - - what I - - I ain't all about riding. I'm all about meeting people and, you know, finding out things and that. And I meet gobs of people, and I've lost count of how many that have moved here from out of state, retired people, rich people and that. And I said well, what brings you to a poor place like Texas and Dent County or Shannon County. And their first answer will be the riding on the river. So these people have come in here and bought a half-a-million dollar farm and built a half-million-dollar house on it, they're driving a sixty-thousand-dollar truck, pulling a seven-thousand-dollar trailer, spending god knows what on tack and feed. And if anybody thinks horse riding's cheap, they've got another thing coming. And this is all going into the economy in four counties around here. You understand what I'm saying? I'm talking to you like I'm talking to you, and I'm actually talking to that. But anyway, that's just really what I wanted to say. If they cut the horse riding down on the river down there, they're going to kill a lot of money into the economy. I'm going to quit before I say anything I shouldn't say. I realize that you're not the bad guy. I try to be friendly to everybody. Matter of fact, I guess I am. I've been riding since '91, I've got friends all up and down the river, and they maybe talk about the

conflict between the horse riders and the canoer. Since 1991, I've never had a conflict. They - - most of the canoers love the horses. They just - - I don't have any problem. But now, I'm not a guy that's out trying to make a problem or stir a problem. You know, I'm easy-going and I'm friendly. If you speak to somebody and they don't speak back, just go along and leave them alone. That's just common sense. But I guess some people don't possess that. You know what I'm saying? But if you think about it, '91, 2001, what is it? 22 years, 23 years now, I have had no problems, and I live on that river from the first of April to the last of October. Other than, you know, during the work week, I have to work. But on the weekends, I'm there all the time. Anyway, I'm going to shut up.

#### STATEMENT OF TODD KINERK:

TODD KINERK: Okay. I'm sure it's not in the plan, but one thing they've needed for a long time is mile markers on the river. Sign - - you know, little thing says mile one, two, three, four, five, whatever, like that. Most people on the river don't have - - don't have a clue where they're at. And there's no way to know. If they had anything, it would be helpful to the visitor. So that's my suggestion.

#### STATEMENT OF JAMES ALMOND:

JAMES ALMOND: So basically, I prefer either Alternative B or A, with the idea that we keep as much area semi-wilderness as possible, with virtually no motorized vehicles in the upper reaches. At the lower end of the river, I wouldn't be opposed to motorized boats. But I don't like the idea of stirring up the sediment in the bottom of the river and destroying the fish eggs and so on. And so it's basically to keep it as close to what it is as possible. It's a unique area that can't be duplicated, it isn't being duplicated anywhere. So we want to keep the unnecessary traffic out of the riverway itself, particularly. I'm not opposed to hiking trails, perhaps even horse trails, if they're away from the river. I don't like the idea of crossing. If they've got to cross, they can cross at the access points. Keep them out of the river. I want to retain the natural resources we have, in other words the mills, the fire towers. That's what they're doing anyway. And I like what they've been doing all along. But I don't like the urban influence that's come in that destroys the territory. The urban influence, meaning the drinking and all that sort of

thing, particularly. I've floated the river a number of times with my family, and it's an enjoyable experience. Anyway, but that basically is the idea, to keep it as natural as possible, like it was 100 years ago, 150 years ago, rather than modernize it with too many parking lots and too many access points. I think that covers it. I like what they're doing, have been doing, and I think their head's in -- head's in the right place, but we've got the rednecks that come in and destroy it.

#### STATEMENT OF DALE COUNTS:

DALE COUNTS: First thing I'd like to say is I wish they'd just give it back to the State, let the State take care of the riverways ourselves. I have a feeling that probably won't happen, so in this plan that they're wanting to do, it's going to -- I'm County Commissioner of Shannon County. And it's going to affect our county revenue. But if they would just maybe leave the riverway open from Pulltite up and Bay Creek up in the off season -- they're wanting to close it right now completely to boat owners. But let them run in the off season. That's the best time -- that's when we gig and trap and hunt. There's no canoes on the river to amount to anything. That's my main deal. And then not letting us camp on the gravel bars, shutting us off from -- if you float in in a canoe, you can camp on any gravel bar you want to. But a local cannot pull their camper down on a gravel bar and camp on it. But my main deal is I wish they'd leave.

#### STATEMENT OF DAVID SNIDER

DAVID SNIDER: I don't know what all this is about or nothing, but I'm against, you know, where they're having to close the roads and stuff like that off the river. I enjoy -- we don't ever ride down there much, but I enjoy riding horses down there every once in a while. We probably don't ride down there two or three times a year. We ride different places, you know, me and the wife, and sometimes a few more people, you know. And I used to love the joy of -- of fishing down there all the time. My grandpa had a big farm. Just right when you get out of Montauk, you know, State Park, that first farm was my grandma and grandpa's. Because I grew up on the river, sort of more or less, and fished all the time. But anymore, you know, it's hard to get down there to fish. You know, they've got so many canoes. That's -- I think you ought to have maybe a little restraint on -- a little bit fewer canoes, you know, where people could



fish, you know, and ride horses a little bit if they want to, or - - or this and that. But that's about the only comment. I hate to see them close the roads, because I enjoy that part of it. You know, I don't know why they would want to close the roads to begin with. Do you? Do you know? I don't understand what's going on, really, you know, why they'd want to take it away from the people that's enjoyed it all these years, you know. Which I don't think we've hurt it all that much, you know. Because, you know, my grandpa and grandma, you know, they come in and, you know, they bought up - - I guess the government bought up like a quarter of a mile, each one. But they got to live there until they died, then nobody else could live on the property, you know. Things have changed a lot since I was young. You know, I'm - - I'm 71 years old now. I don't know how much longer I've got. So thank you. That's about all I have to say. Thank you very much.

#### STATEMENT OF SHERMAN ODOM AND MARSHA ODOM

MARSHA ODOM: I can't remember if Plan A or C was the more extreme. Plan B would be the one that I think suits our locale the best, the Upper Current, which we feel like is where we see the most impact.

SHERMAN ODOM: And understand, we own and operate the Holiday Inn Express here in Salem. So we're associated with the tourism business. We also own the drugstore here in Salem, along with several rental properties. So we're very invested in this area. And our - - probably one of my concerns - - and I've been a horseback rider - - not currently, kind of retired from that - - is that in the past, we - - it's been our impression that "no use is best use" has been the attitude of the management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, and we would disagree with that. And we realize that the national park is indeed a national park to be used by everybody, owned by everybody in the United States. But it does impact our local economy significantly. And so we would like to see it utilized not only for canoer, but for horseback riding, for hiking, for various different things that it can be used for. Part of the problem with the conflict with the horses is the park system has never - - never is the wrong word - - the wrong - - has invested little - - very little in establishing established trails. And that's been a real problem, so you have people that ride outside of the, quote, established trails, and establish their own trails. And I mean, it's - - it gets to be chaotic.

MARSHA ODOM: And harassment.

SHERMAN ODOM: And harassment. And we probably need less river crossings for the horses, but in order to do that, you have to establish some

established trails that don't just meander back and forth across the - - you know, across the river. They need to actually get on one side of the river. And realize you're going to have to cross occasionally, but you don't have to cross every half mile or mile.

MARSHA ODOM: Canoeing.

SHERMAN ODOM: Canoeing, we had a real problem - - and again, this is kind of a selfish interest - - that we have several guests that have stayed at the Holiday Inn Express that come down explicitly to float on the - - on the Current River, and have been, quote, harassed. I think hopefully they've got this one under control. Such things as wading in the - - the natural springs - - Welch Springs. And they were given tickets for wading across the springs, whereas if they go up and wade in Medlock Springs, they aren't given a ticket because it belongs to the - -

MARSHA ODOM: I've been to Welch Springs, and there might be twenty people wading in the spring. But yet if nobody is wading in the spring and a Park Service attendant is - - ranger is there, they will issue a ticket. It's not well posted. Those kinds of rules are not well defined on the river. I don't want to wade in the spring. It's too cold. But - -

SHERMAN ODOM: Right.

MARSHA ODOM: That's a problem.

SHERMAN ODOM: Signage is a real problem.

I mean, my grandson and my son and I, last fall, went down and floated the river, and decided to camp at Sinking Creek. And anyway, we pull a canoe up there, went and made camp. And anyway, rather - - and it is all right - - rather indignant park personnel come down and asked us if we had paid our fee. And I said I'd be glad to pay a fee, but I have no clue what we're supposed to pay, because the signage was for - - it wasn't made so that if you were coming from the river, you saw it. You only saw the signage that you need to pay a fee if you drove into the site. So signage has been a real problem down there. And another thing that needs to be done, if we're - - there are no - - when we go to the Lake, go to Lake of the Ozarks, you go to Norfolk Lake, there are mile-marker signs on the lake. Never has there been any mile-marker signs on the Current River. And it's something that would be most helpful.

MARSHA ODOM: Really a good idea.

SHERMAN ODOM: Oh, it would be most helpful. And you don't have to make them intrusive, as far as the natural beauty. Just a simple sign saying this is the 42nd mile, you go another mile, say this is 43rd mile. It would really be most helpful. Something very inexpensive to do, and be very, very helpful. And not only - - it's a life safety deal. You know, if somebody turns over in a canoe, you know,

I turned over at the 43 mile marker, you know, rather than I turned over and there's a big root wad here. Nobody knows where it's at. That's something that really needs to be done. And I know it's been mentioned before, but nobody ever picked up on it. Know anything else? "No use is best use" is not acceptable. That's probably my biggest deal. It's - - I mean, it's a national treasure, and needs to be used. But wisely. I understand that. Anything else? MARSHA ODOM: I can't think of anything.

#### STATEMENT OF BRIAN GLENN

BRIAN GLENN: I just - - I don't know why they can't make from Baptist to Pulltite seasonal. You know, I'd really rather not just have any kind of changes on the river. And my concern is closing traditional roads that's been - - that we've used for years, you know. But that - - that's going to affect local people on the - - on the motors. It's going to affect trapping and gigging and fishing if we can't use motor boats up on the upper part. You know, we've always done that. And I just - - I'd rather not have any changes, but if they're going to change it, just make it seasonal, you know, like they did the other - - I don't know what the - - I'm trying to think. I - - like you know, I don't know why they can't just make it seasonal - - at least seasonal, you know, if they're going to change it. I guess that's about it. I can't think of anything else I'm wanting to say. But I just - - I would just as soon not have any changes, but if they're - - my main concern is the boats and road closures. Okay.

#### STATEMENT OF JOHN JOHNSTON

JOHN JOHNSTON: Well, I mean, I've only got two statements. One's on the - - the size of the motors on the river, and - - and the closing of the roads. I think they should leave - - leave open to the public. I mean, it was public ground when they - - when they took it over. But as far as the motors, I don't think there should be any restrictions on them. That's my - - that's really all I've got.

(Ending time: 8:00 p.m.)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3072    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Transcript  
**Correspondence:** HEARING HELD AT  
VAN BUREN YOUTH & COMMUNITY CENTER  
1204 D HIGHWAY

VAN BUREN, MISSOURI 63965

JANUARY 21, 2014

(Starting time of the hearing: 8:00 p.m.)

(Statement from Congressman Jason Smith read by Mr. Darren Lingle attached to hearing transcript.)

## TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

MR. GOOD: Good evening. My name is Tim Good. I consider it an honor to be with you this evening. I'll be facilitating the wilderness hearing with you tonight, and I always look forward to an opportunity to come down to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I want to take a moment to thank you. I have the unfortunate experience of attending meetings like this in other parts of the country where I can count on one hand how many people showed up for the meeting. I cannot tell you how disheartening it is that so few American people have an interest in the national parks. This is a compliment to you and your families that you gave up your evenings here to be here to speak about this park. I know there were 400 people attended at Eminence, which is extraordinary. 200 people showed up at Salem, and I've talked to some of you got who had to get babysitters. One person had to leave a disabled son at home to be here tonight. This speaks all so well for you, the interest in your parks, in your community, in your country. Out of respect, I would like to begin with the Pledge of Allegiance. Please rise and remove your hats.  
(At this time the Pledge of Allegiance was recited)

MR. GOOD: This evening we will hold a public hearing on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft Wilderness Suitability study. We're here because of a law that was passed in 1964. It's called the Wilderness Act. It requires the National Park Service to study lands within the National Park Service system to determine if any of those lands are suitable for wilderness designation. The National Park Service study over 80,000 acres that comprise the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The criteria for wilderness designation is very, very strict. Of those 80,000 acres only 3,430 acres, just four percent of the park, met that criteria. These acres are within the Big Spring wilderness study area. Now, it's important to understand that this proposal may lead to the National Park Service director passing it on to the Secretary of the Interior who then may pass it on to the President of the United States who then may pass it on to the United States Congress. If there's only one thing that

I ask you to remember from this evening is that the power to designate a wilderness area lies with the United States Congress and not with the National Park Service. The power lies with your federally-elected representatives, not with unelected federal employees. Now, currently the area is being managed for wilderness values. If the area's designated as wilderness, the fire tower, the incinerator, the barn, the civilian conservation court buildings will remain; however, the National Park Service training range will be removed. Administrative use of the roads will be discontinued, and they may be repurposed as hiking trails. Now, there's one very important person I'd like to introduce to you this evening. It's because of her work that the comments that you make tonight will be recorded not only for the Americans of today but most importantly for those Americans yet to come. I want you to give a warm welcome to Kathy - - to Joanna Charlton, who's being the court reporter for this evening. I'd also like to thank Kathy Alfred. Is she around? She just did an extraordinary job helping reserve this, and two times it was canceled. And both times she was able to get it re-reserved for us tonight. If you get a chance, please thank her for her efforts. I'd also like to recognize one other group tonight. If there's any American veterans here, could you please stand up? I'd just like to - - Richard, I know you're one. Please thank you for your service to our country.

Okay. For the hearing, I know I've talked to at least one person here who is going to stand up before you and give some comments. It's important to understand that for this next part these comments are supposed to be addressed to the wilderness area designation. This time has not been allotted for other issues of general management plan, for other issues involving the park. It is just for the wilderness designation. The Park Service will take these into consideration to determine what, if any, changes will be made to the proposal, and again, the comments made here are being recorded. It will be part of the permanent record, and they will be made available on the internet.

As for the procedures for this evening, each one of you have signed up back there when you came in. You had an opportunity to sign. You should have a card with a number on it. We're going to go in numeric order. We have two microphones here. Now, due to the number of people that want to speak, fortunately each person will have three minutes to speak, and this gentleman here is going to keep track of the time. When there's one minute remaining, he will hold up a yellow card. When the time is expired, he will hold up the red card, which means the person at the next podium will be able to start speaking then. So the person with number one card why don't you come forward. The

person with number two - - who's got number two? Okay. You can stand there. So all the evens are going to be on this side. Odd numbers are going to be on this side. When you begin, what I'd like you to do if you feel comfortable is just state your name, where you live, and your association, and you can begin your comments. Okay. How about three and up line up over here just for ease, person number three, four, five.

MS. GLASSMAN: Hi, my name is Vickie Glassman. I do live in Van Buren. I grew up in Shannon County, so I've lived here all my life. We've enjoyed the wilderness, the rivers generation to generation, and it has not gotten worse. I'm 62 years old, and I don't see it getting worse. I've seen Big Spring park get worse when the Park Service took it over. I don't mean to offend anybody here from the Park Service, but it's not pretty like it used to be. What's going to happen when you take our wilderness. We take care of it. Our families, our generations taking care of this land because this land is who we are. Van Buren is a destination. It's a destination for families. It's a destination for tourists because of the environmental treasures. I own a small art gallery in town. It's local and regional artists. It's local art from local people. I'm afraid once - - if we don't stand up and start taking charge and watching our leaders and making them responsible, then they're going to chip it away little by little. My ancestors were Cherokee Indians, and you all know what happened to Native Americans. The government took the land, and they moved them off. They ruined the culture. We have to protect our culture, and I thought that that was part of why the Park Service was here, to protect the cultural heritage around here. I don't see that happening. If they cared, they wouldn't be doing what they're trying to do. I'm afraid that if it's passed and if they keep interfering, chipping away at our way of life, then it's going to die, as well. Our businesses need it. Mr. Good touched on that. I'd like to say, Mr. Good, I don't trust the government. I don't trust them as far as I can spit. Every day it gets worse. It gets worse. We the people are stronger than the people in charge. We have more power than the people in power. We need to stand up and take our lives back and keep it the way it is, and the government - - I'll not say what I want to say.

MS. MOSS: My name is Charlotte Moss. I live in Ellington, was born in Eminence. I am with a family that is a sixth generation user of Current River, and I might want to put a little thing in here that I could not leave a comment. The thing didn't work. I tried at home and I tried here. My speech is very short. I am not for the wilderness. I agree that the government can't really be trusted in a lot of this

stuff. They led us to believe that one thing that happened or wouldn't happen, and it just - - you just - - I get exasperated, but anyway, my comment is I am not for the wilderness whatsoever.

MR. WOMACK: My name is Joe Womack, born and raised here. I work and live on the river at Montgomery Cabins actually inside of Big Springs park. With the wilderness package my main concern is accessibility, if they're going to close roads whether I could even drive back home or not or to work. A lot of people don't understand the wilderness and the natural areas. It mainly closes everything out to the public to all people to stay natural to the animals, wildlife out there. I have more questions than comments. I'm sure I won't get any answers tonight, but I hopefully will in the future. Main concern with the wilderness is the road closures, inaccessibility, and I'm with her as far as not trusting the government.

MR. COOKSON: I'm Representative Steve Cookson from the 153rd. I represent the areas in which we are sitting in presently. I have lived in this area for decades and have enjoyed the Current River. I have had relatives all up and down through Carter and Ripley County that have grown up along the Current River. I would like to just go on the record as saying that the state legislature, which I serve on the committee for in the House on natural resources, is in complete solidarity with our Congressman Jason Smith, which we had the pleasure of serving with before he went to work in Washington, DC for the people. So all the things that Jason said a while ago we are in complete agreement with. I believe I speak for if not all my colleagues a vast majority of them. I would also like to say that, you know, this park came into existence because the people of this area and the people of the State of Missouri saw fit not to let dams be put on this river. These were state parks, three of the finest state parks in the whole state and in the Midwest, and we deeded those over to the federal government with a promise that they would always be accessible and always be available for our people and other people across the nation to come and enjoy. And I see this as an encroachment upon that promise that was made, and if I can also say that one of the things that we - - that we gave up when we decided not to let this become a dammed-up couple of lakes along here was economic opportunity. Lakes would've brought a lot more economic opportunity, but we chose to protect it like it is right now. And that's what we want to see continue is that it be protected, and we were the people that first started protecting the river long before the federal government came and started managing it for us. We're ready to take it back if need be. Thank you.

MR. FITZWATER: I'm State Representative Paul Fitzwater from the 4th District. What an honor it is to be here. I'm been standing over there trying to think how to be nice about this whole thing. Obviously, you know, I'm up here, and I'm supposed to be talking about the wilderness area. But as we all know, the wilderness plan it's dead. It's gone. It's not going to happen. The true issue here is that we have the federal government that thinks they know what's best for our lives. I tell you what. I don't know about you, but I'm very sick of it. I'm sick of it. You know, and I know I'll probably get cut off here, but obviously the regulations and the new mandates that they're trying to - - I won't say the rivers but they're trying to put into our lives here obviously why put more and more regulations on the rivers when they can't enforce what they have in the first place? You think about that. It's the truth. Why are we allowing that? This is a great group of people. I don't think - - I hope they understand that a lot of people in this area they depend upon the rivers for their livelihood, and the economic impact that's going to happen in this area is - - it's a tragedy. It really is. I think we in the Missouri capitol as Representative Cookson says we have worked very hard. We'll continue to work. I just think it's time that we in Missouri here we take back our rivers. Many of us are going to travel to Kirkwood tomorrow, and you know what bothers me? We've got many of you that will be traveling up there, spending your money on gas and the time, and obviously I'm not saying you don't have the money. But that's - - you know, I guess my question is why are we going to Kirkwood? Why are we going to Kirkwood? I mean, I guess the bottom line is obviously - - I bet there won't be ten people in the whole building up there besides us and those on the Jack Forks where the Current Rivers are in the first place, and I'm very excited, you know. I know that the National Park Service is fixing a great expansion on the Gateway Arch up there. They're going to build out over 70, you know. This is awesome, you know. They're going to spend millions of dollars up there, but I'm beginning to wonder when - - I want to know when is the National Park Service going to come down here and have these informational meetings, and that's what we think about their building the Gateway Arch up there, their project. You know what, if they're going to get their opinions up there about our rivers, maybe we should give more opinion about our Gateway Arch up there. I know I'm out of time. You know, people, I came down here in 2009, started knocking on doors in Reynolds County and Shannon County. They told me that a republican couldn't get elected down there, and I just said, wait a minute, don't tell me I can't do that. But I worked hard, but I knew immediately that the river was important to you. It's our way of living.



We claim the rivers. You know, there's going to be some people, a lot of people, that will lose their lives on the river from drownings because, you know what, you boaters how many of you have drug people out of the river? How many of you have gone and drug people out of the river to save their lives? Where are the park rangers going to be when those people need their help? They're not going to be there. All right. So let's keep working hard. I know I'm done. Thank you.

MR. ROSS: I'm Representative Robert Ross. I have Texas County, portions of Phelps, Pulaski, and also Howell County. This is a personal issue for me. I actually was raised in the Summersville area, actually the continental divide, if you will, between the Jacks Fork and the Current River. My wife's from Eminence. We enjoy taking our family down the river, and really that's what this is about. You know, for generations the people of this area have been good stewards of this land, and we've taken care of it. And now that the federal government has come in - - and once again, it's been incremental the amount of restrictions and further regulations that have been placed upon this area. We're now seeing it head once again in the direction of where, you know, back as Representative Cookson said this was originally turned into the scenic riverways so that all, you know, all individuals from this point forward would be able to have access and be able to use and enjoy our gems that we have here. With regard to the wilderness area and the rest of the general management plan, I just, you know, want to keep my comments short, but I want to make a commitment, a commitment to the National Park Service that if you're going to continue to try to shove this down our throats as long as I am in office - - and I don't care what the office is - - I will continue to pursue any avenue that I can to bring this back under state control to make it available to the people. I want to speak to one other thing. I know that Superintendent Black was mentioned in the Salem paper that you've heard from all these elected officials that unanimously every one of them are opposed to this plan. I want you to think about this, you know. Within this - - within this room, you know, we all have different ideas about, you know, how we handle this and that situation, but for every county commissioner, every state representative, every senator, all the way up to, you know, our U.S. representative to all be in solidarity and opposition to this garbage I just want you all to think about that for a minute and to understand where that's at. We are every one of us opposed, and it's great to work with, you know, individuals like Representative Fitzwater and Cookson, and we appreciate all that they do. But the Park Service, you have my commitment. I'll be watching. Thank you.

MR. KING: My name Jerry King, and I live in Shannon County. The monitor said that we're supposed to talk about the wilderness area. Okay. Let's talk about the wilderness area. The congressman has told many of us that there will be no wilderness designation, but yet we have 3,400 acres in it's 534-page plan that are designated as wilderness area. We don't trust you. We do not trust the Park Service. We were told - - there were meetings in Thayer. There were meetings in Texas County, Shannon County. We were told we can't afford to go there. We can't afford to pay for the gas to get there because our budget is so slim. There's five people here from Omaha and Denver who flew in just for this meeting. You're bringing people in from other parts of the country paying six-figured salaries, and they look down their nose at people who make \$20,000 a year. I'm told by the Chamber of Commerce in Eminence that 18 million dollars a year comes through that city due to tourism. If you impact tourism even the slightest amount, you're going to hurt the people there. According to your own figures in your own book, \$24,000 is the average income in Shannon County. That's not very much, but the Park Service superintendent makes \$145,000 a year. The deputy superintendent makes \$125,000 a year. He supervises five people who make \$100,000 dollars a year. Your budget's all about your salary. It's not about managing this ground for us. We resent it. We resent that you bring people in from the outside, pay them a bunch of money so they can look down their noses at us. We're not happy with that. We're not happy at all. The congressman said there won't be a wilderness area, but you're going to edge it in just like the heritage area of the plan, the Blueway plan. You're always coming up with something new. Just go back in the office and formulate a new idea. There's nothing but smoke and mirrors in that 534 pages. Thank you.

MR. STEWART: My name is John Stewart. I live in Eminence, Missouri, and I'm a former mayor of Eminence. And I grew up in Jacks Fork Hallow off of Spring Valley, Round Springs, Missouri. I lived all my life in Round Springs and read the newspapers, and we started out with nine positions at Round Springs when the National Park Service come in. We got one part-time now. They wiped us out. That's all that's left, but let's go back to the enabling legislation in 1964. This is even more important. The legislation went over about three things conserve, preserve, and recreate. Now, these were set up in 1964 in legislation, and they were all on equal footing. They were on equal footing until special interest groups came in and wanted us to go to wilderness areas. There's where the wilderness areas come in. The enabling legislation from 1964 has no place, anywhere,

form, or fashion that says we can have wilderness. It says preserve. We had Ozark farms all up and down the river. I don't see them preserved anywhere. We had roads and trails going into the rivers. I don't see them preserved anymore anywhere. I don't see the historic buildings, the civil war cemeteries, the family cemeteries, and anything else preserved up and down these Rivers. They try to smooth them over and wipe them out. You can't even get to most of them anymore. Now, I get pretty emotional about these kind of things because I was born and raised to this. Why can they come in and say one special interest group can take away our use of motorboats, take away use of campgrounds, powder mills, campgrounds? There's no campground at Acres anymore. By the way, that was my father-in-law's place. Goose Neck's gone. I'm just from Round Springs the upper river. Okay. I don't understand the lower end, but it's a microcosm. It works all from one end to the other, folks, and what I'm going to say about this whole situation is let's go back to the enabling legislation in 1964. Let's not pretend we want A, B, C, or what we got now. Let's go back to the original and make them live by what was put forth by the congressman. That's what I got to say about it. That's what we got to do. I can't even boat for anyone plus what we got now. We don't have any park rangers to speak of that's from around here. I talk about places I don't know where I'm talking about. I'm 64 years old. I served in the military. I've done my part as an American. I want to be able to go to the river and enjoy it and not have to put up with tourists being naked. I don't want to be run over by some drunk out there either. The rangers need to get out there and do their job. There's not enough of them. There's not enough money. I know that, but I'm not going to be out there breaking the law. I might. I don't know. Sometimes I will. There's too many of them. I don't know what they all are, but listen, let's give it back to the state. Let's give it to somebody that can take care of it. Let's be able to get back to the family cemeteries and other places. That's what I got to say.

MR. RAMSEY: I'll Allen Ramsey. I live over at Eminence. I lived in - - born and raised in this country and was up in Salem the other night and talking to one of the park personnel, and they commented that they was going to have this 3,500 acres down there. And he also said, now, we got a place across from Pulltite up here. I thought, boy, I was reading in the paper. I didn't really see anything that included this area up here, so tonight I went over and talked to the gentleman. He said this guy over here takes care of it. Well, essentially after talking to him, they just took it on their own. He says they had a barn there. They moved their stuff out, shut the road off, so they've essentially already made it a wilderness area.

It's unofficial, but if we don't follow up and make sure that they do not just keep people out of there, you know, they're going to make them a wilderness area in spite of what congress does. They want it, so I thought that was, you know. At these meetings when you go talk to the park personnel, you know, I don't know. I've heard that so many times, and I would've thought with them representing the Park Service they should've been able to answer our questions. I'm sure you all have the same deal, so anyway that's all I've got to say, but I just - - you know, they've already - - and if y'all want to talk to this guy back here, he can tell you the same thing. That's what he told me that they already started pulling their stuff out like they're all ready to designate it.

MR. SLACK: I'll be quick, folks. A lot of people in this room - - my name is Mike Slack. I'm from Thayer. I'm with a group called the Ozarks Property Rights Coalition. A lot of folks in this room fought something called the White River Blueway a few months ago. Who all was against that? That was the Department of the Interior, the same group that controls the National Park Service, also the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I trust the Department of the Interior as much as the Indians did. Okay. But most people said we couldn't beat the Blueway, and we did. We had probably 20 groups in Missouri, 12 in Arkansas that got together with all the elected officials in this room and a lot of others. If we stand firm here and make clear that we all believe that, while we have a lot of nice folks who work for the Park Service, this was a dog and pony show today. Now, on the wilderness area, is there anyone here who doesn't work for either the Park Service or Claire McCaskill who is for it? Okay. There's one. Anybody else? Okay. I'd say the vast majority do not want the wilderness area. Okay. And that's it. Thanks.

MR. JACKSON: My name is Matt Jackson. I have lived in Van Buren my whole life. I was born and raised here. My dad worked for the Park Service for 32 years. They want to designate a wilderness area? They got out one out at Irish Wilderness if they want to play with one. Not many people go out there do anything because it's just walking access if you do anything, so if they need a wilderness to play in there's plenty out there. They don't have to deal with another one here in this county. As far as the management plan, if they were to use the money they spent on this to actually run our park service, we might not have had local people mow their grass down there for them, and I think any more infringement on the rights of the people on using this river is just that, an infringement on their rights. I understand that people all across the nation had the opportunity

to use this, but I don't think special interests like environmental groups that can flood in their comments to swing one way or another on a management plan should be used over the rights of the people that actually live here. I think a person that comes here for a month shouldn't designate me what I can do on the river on upper or lower running a boat because they're only here for one weekend, one week, or whatever. They might have big ideas, but I don't see many people out there hiking, biking, or anything like that on their own. If they were to come down here and hike, there's plenty of hiking to be done on forest service property or anything else, so I don't see any damage being done more so than what they would be doing by closing stuff off, and it's just going to be a shame that they would do this to the people in this area. I feel worse for the people of the park service here because they're good people. They're local people, and they don't want this either. They know there's going to be rangers out there that are going to be enforcing laws that they don't believe in because it's just something that come down from people that don't understand what they're dealing with. They don't ever come to this area or even want to be a part of this area, that they want to enforce their will upon this area, so I feel for the Park Service here in that regard because they're local. And they're good people, so I hope they have enough say to sway what's going to happen on this and at least stay with the no - - do nothing plan or go like that guy says back to the way it was in the beginning. Thanks.

MR. HAGAN: I am terrified, so bear with me. I was raised a Baptist, and my mother always said even if you are in the minority you got to be truthful. And I'm going to be truthful. I am not terrified of our government. I vote. I don't always get in office people who I want, but I do vote. And I do believe that our government works for the good of the people. That's why I was terrified. Thank you. Thank you. You're helping me get over my terror. I will restrict my comments, unlike most everyone else, to the wilderness issue. They are not calling, as first Jason Smith's clone said, they cannot declare a wilderness. They are talking about managing an area that has been managed as wilderness and continuing to manage it. That said with the one - - with the few exceptions, there would be a road closed and maybe converted to a hiking trail. I have lived in Missouri the greater portion of my life, and I start collecting Social Security next year. I travel a lot to other states, and I go to wilderness areas. I believe this will be good for Van Buren, for Eminence, and I live in Reynolds County, who will have a little effect on Reynolds County. So I do know that I'm not alone in speaking my mind on this, that there other people from Reynolds County, from St. Francois, from this county

who want to see the National Park Service succeed. We've seen the problems. We've experienced - - there's many people who have stopped coming to the rivers because of the problems, and I think that the park service has gone out of their way. There will continue to be baptisms. That's ridiculous for anybody to say that you would need a permit to have a baptism on the river.

MS. GLASSMAN: They did.

MS. HAGAN: Who did it?

MS. GLASSMAN: The Park Service.

MS. HAGAN: Who? Did the Park Service stop a baptism in a river?

MS. GLASSMAN: No, they didn't stop it.

They required a permit. You better find out.

MS. HAGAN: I've watched baptisms in these rivers.

MS. GLASSMAN: I was baptized in that river.

MS. HAGAN: I've stood there. Nobody walked up and said you got to have a - -

MS. GLASSMAN: I didn't need a permit, and I was baptized.

MS. HAGAN: Then the Park Service was wrong on that occasion. I'll agree with that. You do not need a permit to have a baptism, so thank you.

MS. BOYD: Okay. Hi, everybody. My name's Candy Boyd and I am not a politician. Beyond that, I live in Doniphan, and my family has been in southern Missouri dating back to the Osage and the Cherokee and the original settlers. My grandmother's name was Yocum, and we've been around. I just want to say that I would like to - - if all of us can imagine beyond politics and also I just like to look at the wilderness plan, not looking at A, B, C, D and not whether we trust this one or that one or that one, but honestly, if we just look at the wilderness plan, it might work because the area has been managed by the State of Missouri and through the years and over the decades as a wilderness area. And some of that area's pretty pristine property, and it is - - they've reintroduced deer, and so it's been good for deer hunting. They've opened it up now to bow hunting. It's good for the water quality. The only roads that they're talking about closing off, ironically, it's only government employees that can go on those roads now, so the only limitation is to government employees. It's kind of a levelling of the playing field where, you know, those of us who've been saying, hey, we can't go down those roads anymore why are they able to down the roads. Well, now they're going to have to put their boots on, too, and so there's really not a lot of change there. But what it will do is designate that area as a wilderness area. Now, I'm raised in Missouri. I self-educated myself. Before I was a schoolteacher. I've been around the world working in the tourism

industry. Okay. And honestly, honestly, honestly I think I can say to you that the reason that 18 million dollars a year is coming through Eminence - - I'm sorry it's not coming through Doniphan, but the reason it's coming through Eminence is because it's a national park. And when people in tourism look at it, they say, oh, look here's a pretty national park in Missouri. I can go there and kayak on rivers - - and this is what breaks my heart. I'm so glad we still have it here in southern Missouri - - on rivers that are still clean. I can tell you. I've travelled the world in tourism, and I love, I mean, I'm outside all the time. As soon as school's over, I'm out on the rivers or out near the river, and I've got kids in my classroom. They're out on the river all the time, and we love those rivers. But I can honestly tell you that up in St. Charles County they used to have clean rivers and lakes. And at the Lake of the Ozarks and even the Mississippi River when I was kid we used to be able to go swim in there, and now they don't. There's part - - so we've got to preserve it. We've got to preserve it, and if you do nothing else, just think of what's best for the water quality. How can we preserve - - because outside of Costa Rica, I can honestly tell you there's not very many places in the world that have these clean rivers, and so on behalf of my ancestors and on behalf - - look forward to the seventh generation, to our grandchildren. We want to keep these rivers clean, and how can we do it? The National Park Service has been happen - - right, but they've been helping us. They've been helping us. They really have, and so just do whatever we need to do. But if it's designated as a wilderness area, it will bring in tourism dollars, and the National Park Service can help keep it clean. They're not the CIA. They're not the NSA. They can help us, and many of the National Park Service employees that are here tonight were born and raised in Van Buren, maybe not born here, but they were raised here. So just let's just think about how can we all come to common solutions and keep it nice and clean. All I can say about that is the standard government says anybody has to have a permit to hold a ceremony. The Lakota, who've lived up in the Black Hills and own the Black Hills, they have to ask for permits, too, so we're not - - the baptisms are going to keep going. We're fine. All we can do is the best that we can, and I'm just asking that we try to keep it clean.

MR. EVANS: Okay. Maybe I'll just cut this off. My name is Michael Evans. I do a radio program here, and the name of the program is American's Voice Now. I know many of you listen. We stepped in and made an effort to defend this area against the Blueways when we saw that monster coming down the road, and we were successful in doing that. But I notice that when Mr. Good came up and began his program he mentioned a

couple of things that I thought were worthy of mentioning. He brought out that all the power lies with Congress and that no authority will be given without Congress's - - without Congress's permission. I'd like to take this thing on a different trek for a second. This is an administrative agency, and it's an administrative agency that operates out of any constitutional authority whatsoever. There are only two constitutional agencies that exist. One is border patrol, and the other is commerce, ladies and gentlemen. And the other myriad of hundreds or even thousands of agencies that exist, including this one, have no authority. Thomas Jefferson himself said to us that those laws that are made that are not pursuant to the constitution are null and void and have no effect, and with all due respect, this is an agency that is making law. They may call it a rule. They may call it a regulation, but it parades about as law. If you can be fined, penalized, your property taken from you, if you can go to court and are listened to and heard before an administrative judge without a jury, ask yourself is that constitutional ruling? The truth is they want to have this meeting up in Kirkwood tomorrow not because Kirkwood has any involvement here. I mean, does Chicago come to us and ask us if it's a good idea if they pave their runways or highways? We may go there occasionally, but we really have no say in it. The truth of the matter is it's the area of all of these nongovernmental agencies that are influencing these people are the ones who are making these decisions. This is - - what you've seen and experienced here and what we've been seeing in all of these meetings and we've seen it routinely. We saw it in the Blueway. We saw it in the Biosphere. We saw it on every one of these organizers, Delphi Technique. If you don't know what the Delphi Technique is, I'd like all of you to write that word down, Delphi, D-E-L-P-H-I. I'd like you to go home and look it up. What it is is it's a manipulative system that is designed and intended for you to do one thing to reach a public consensus that they have already predetermined, and that's why there's very, very little public commentary. That's why we're limited to three minutes, because they know that for all intents and purposes all of these written comments we'll never know whether they're all actually submitted or not. It's a sham. This entire thing is a joke. This concept has been used over and over and over, and it's used in everything. You see it in Common Core and everything else. Look, the simple truth is this. Here's the real reality of this. We've been given false coercive choices at the point of a gun. That's why we gave them the property in the first place because it was either dams or the NPS, and we chose the lesser of two evils. And now we're given another choice of the lesser of two other evils. How many more evils do we have to live



with before there's really nothing left of us here?  
That's the simple truth, ladies and gentlemen. This organization, this National Park Service needs to leave. They need to return this property to the State of Missouri. We can take care of it ourselves. We can put people in place who don't need to make \$150,000 a year and have three or four people under them each making equal money. The truth is, Washington, you may leave now.

MS. RAY: Hello. Hi, name is Nancy Ray.  
I'm from Eminence. I'm sorry to say I'm not a native, but I feel my heart of hearts has always been here. And it's just taken my body a little while to catch up, and they're talking about enterprise and making money. I want to read to you what it actually says about wilderness. It says, except as specifically provided for in act subject to existing private rights, there will - - shall be no commercial enterprise and no permanent road with any - - within any wilderness area designated by this act. Except necessary to meet minimum requirements for the administration of the area for the purpose of this act including measures who require emergency involving the health and safety of persons within the area, there shall be no temporary road, no use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, or motorboat, no landing of aircraft, no other form of mechanical transport, and no structure or installation within any such area. And that's what a wilderness area is. We got to remind them. They do not own this land. It belongs to the people. They're not dictators. They're supposed to be caretakers. Thank you for your time.

MR. GOOD: Thanks very much. Anyone have a card that has not been up to speak? Thanks so much for your time. Thanks for your comments. This concludes the wilderness hearing. Thank you.

(WHEREIN, the hearing was concluded  
at 9:00 p.m.)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3073    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Transcript  
**Correspondence:** OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS OPEN HOUSE  
VAN BUREN YOUTH & COMMUNITY CENTER  
1204 D HIGHWAY  
VAN BUREN, MISSOURI 63965

JANUARY 21, 2014

(Starting time of the open house: 6:00 p.m.)

TRANSCRIPT OF COMMENTS MADE

Kenneth Wood

Ellsinore, Missouri

What I'd like - - I would like to see is no changes whatsoever. That's the comments I want, and I was born on Current River in 1945 just around Big Springs. The park service bought our farm in '68. I was in the service. They come to my mom and told her said - - my dad had already passed away - - my mom, said if you don't sell we're going to take you to court and take this land. She sold, so I have a sort of a disrespect for the park service, not in regard as persons but what they have done. So I would like for no - - nothing to be changed. Stay like it is.

Marylin Sharp

Mountain View, Missouri

Leave it like it is.

Noel Meade

Ellington, Missouri

I fish this river a lot, summer and winter, and a lot of what they're basing on is when it's real busy in the summer. I can go fishing in September, March don't see nobody on the river, and they're trying to say the river is overused. But that's just about 30 days of the year. The rest of the time it's underused really. Other than that, I mean, that's all I'd like to say. I think basically they're doing the wrong thing, just my opinion.

Jack Basham

Eminence, Missouri

I'd like to make a comment that I wouldn't want to lose my boat lunch and Sutton's Creek, Jerktail I don't want to lose any of my boat lunches on Current River because we hit them all, and I see that we're going to take out some of the trails for the trail riders. I'd like to make sure to see that they can still get up to the river and enjoy the scenery. I don't ride horses, but I know a lot of people do. And I'd really like to see the no change actually happen. I like it the way it is. I've lived there for quite some time, and we take care of our parks ourselves, we help, and actually, at Jerktail we're the ones that put the signs up there down there take your trash out. And we go down and pick up the trash when the park service quit doing it here a while back. I mean, we actually take care of what we like, you know. That's about it.

Elizabeth Pageler

Winona, Missouri

Okay. What it is I am against big brother government and their control. I'm also against the damage the four-wheelers do, and I think that that needs to be controlled. And emotionally I'm against it, but I know the damage - - or I know some of the damage they do. I grew up along the Kansas River. If you look at the map furthest north bend in the river, that's where I grew up. Daddy took us kids, and we walked down to the river a lot of Sunday afternoons in the summertime. People come mushroom hunting down there, didn't bother us any. So I'm for people having access to such because God gave it to us, but I'm against them tearing it up and the four-wheeler thing. I lost a nephew. He was married, had two sons, two tours of duty in the Air Force, and he went straight up and fell over backwards. My sister watched it happen, killed him. We lost a grandson. At least he wasn't married or had children, but he had a tour duty in the Navy, was on the USS Ronald Reagan. We got to go and be on there with him, and he was in a buggy or something. It wasn't a four-wheeler. So I'm against some of these activities that they do. I don't think big brother government should take over, but I think they ought to catch them when they're doing something wrong. I mean, that's just as illegal as running a stop sign in my mind, so you know how I feel about stop signs. I don't know what else I can say;

Robert Rowland  
Poplar Bluff, Missouri

I'm against - - I support the no action alternative, but the change to that plan I would like to see is acceptance of the 640 jet. And the reasons I'm against the other alternatives are I'm against spreading out the floaters. I'm against the permit system, and if they are going to have a permit system, it needs to be spelled out so we know ahead of time. I'm against it, but I don't even know what the hell it is, against more horsepower restrictions. And I'm against the limited access.

Brian Keathley  
Van Buren, Missouri

Do not like the idea of having to apply for permits to go floating with canoe, kayak, or raft or anything such as that at all. I'm not real happy with the horsepower limitations they're trying to put on the upper end. The seasonal I don't really care for too much, nor do I like the idea that they're taking our larger motors down below the park. If I had to pick one, I'd pick a C - - a plan C hands down. Wilderness, I'm actually okay with if they want to do wilderness. That's a good thing. I would like to see some of the river crossings, designated river crossings on the

upper end of Current removed. We don't need that many. I don't like the idea of seeing motorized vehicles on gravel bars, but yet I don't want to see all gravel bars closed off. The main thing is Sinking Creek gravel bar I'd like to see open up traditional there the way it always has been. Log yard I don't want to see where people can't bring their campers and stuff out on the river. It's what we've been doing forever, you know. Basically as far as the designated gravel camping that we have now, just leave it alone. If they want to shut down roads to it, that's fine, but if it's county road, it needs to be left alone. Other than that, that's pretty much all I got.

Ike Bartlett  
Ellington, Missouri

I would like to know why there is in all options there is - - why is there no option that - - why isn't there one alternative that decreases the restrictions that are set down that were set back in 1984. That's it. Why is there no alternative that allows more access and is less restrictive than the present situation?

Andrew Hampton  
Ellington, Missouri

My comment, I would like to state that in all three of the alternatives something is taken away, and over the last 20 years I've noticed small things you took every time they try this. If their plan is a funnel plan, I don't know why they're trying to take everything from the general public. It's their right to be over there to be able to use that. There is I guess - - there is nothing in any of the alternatives that says anything about why they're doing what they're wanting to do. They just - - they have to have a management plan, and for no apparent reason why, they're wanting to plan vehicle traffic on non-designated gravel bars. It doesn't state why they want banning motorized watercraft on 48 percent of the riverways. Why are they wanting to get rid of half the number undertaking certain recreational activities such as camps, watercraft, camper, camping, et cetera, closing 55 miles of vehicular road and trails that the State of Missouri has to use to maintain the wildlife and woods and the fish and the waters, close approximately 20 unidentified river access points. What do they deem identified? They all are marked on a map that the park service gives out. Implementing a permit system for equestrian users, why can they do that when they can't keep track of the numbers of horses over there because there's wild horses, feral horses, and there's elk now, so they're not going to be able to see the impact that that has because the wild

horses can roam anywhere they want as the elk can, any animal can. So I don't see how a permit is going to work. All it's going to do is create more money for them that they can use against the public. Imposing new horsepower below Big Springs I don't see what horsepower restrictions will do to help anything. It's going to cause a bigger conflict between people that use it every day and the park service itself, but in none of this at all does it say anything about how many kayaks can be on the river and where they can be at. It doesn't say about how big a kayak you can have or a canoe, where you can put it. It doesn't say anything about that. I mean, I elect for no action to be changed anything. I don't want nothing to be changed what because if you take something away it does not matter what interest group it comes from it's taking away from the general public across the board. If I'm a boater and I want to go horseback riding, I want to be able to do that and not have to worry about what they want. If I'm a canoer or a kayaker, I don't want to be told where I can go put in my canoe or kayak or what stretch of river I can be on. Same as a boater I don't want to be told I can't go here but I can go here. I don't want to be told that I can't use public lands to the full potential as we have in the past. I don't understand why they want to do this. One thing they take away takes away from everything, and they say that they're trying to get closer together from one side of the spectrum to the other to make everybody happy. You're always going to have conflicts no matter what you do, so it's not going to solve any of their problems, and they know that. It's just something that will they say. That's my comment.

Joseph Kelly

Birch Tree, Missouri

On the Jack Fork River I would like to see it kept to be no outboard motors on it, that it be used only for canoeing and tubing down it. I think the river's too shallow, too narrow to accommodate outboard motors, and on the Current River, I would try to restrict motors to at least 40 horsepower on everything at maximum in areas that could sustain it in the wider, you know, wider parts of the river. We probably - - we also need to get more enforcement during the summer. We have a lot of problems with visitors coming and locals too messing up the river in many ways drinking, swearing, going around naked, half sometimes, and then, you know, it hurts it for families going down the river. ATVs there are people that can't walk, and an ATV would be a help for them to see the outer parts that you can't walk to. The problem is that you have ATVs with large horsepower, noisy, and they have a tendency to tear up the tundra or the landscape. That should probably be looked at to address so that we don't have erosion created by tracks from ATVs. That's

about what I have to say.

Rick LaPlant

Piedmont, Missouri

Only question I got on this is back in the early '80s I used to work for the department, and I seen a map showing this whole area in here that they wanted to make it back into pristine forest, all back in natural wilderness is what I'm asking. Is this a foot hole in the door towards that?

Sue Hagan

Lesterville, Missouri

I just want to say that I think the park service has done a marvelous job coming up with these different alternatives. A, B, and C are all great improvements over the way the things have been, and I know the preferred alternative is B. And I think that's a very strong one, so I just hope they succeed in going with that and not make compromises. Especially - - I'm especially concerned with our local legislator, who's been saying he represents the citizens and that they want no changes, I disagree with Representative Fitzwater, and I do want to see changes. I think that the rivers have been mismanaged, and I think that they've got some good proposals.

Eric Bland

Van Buren, Missouri

I want a no action alternative, but I want the big - - Van Buren the Big Springs no horsepower limits, Van Buren to the southern boundary no horsepower limits.

Matt Jackson

Van Buren, Missouri

I feel that the no action plan is the best plan available for this area. All of the other plans limit people of some nature or another from doing what they are entitled to do on the river.

Tony Towner

Van Buren, Missouri

I'd like to go with the no action except for Van Buren down to the southern boundary no limit, no horsepower limit.

Mindy Gallaway

Bunker, Missouri

My comment is the horse trails on designated

versus non-designated I'm opposed to designated horse trails. The national parks are the people's. We should be free to come and go as we like. We don't need a park ranger checking in with us. The recent death of the father and the two sons on the Ozark Trails a designated trail shows that whether it's designated or not accidents, things happen. Where were the park rangers for the designated Ozark Trail? Why did this man and his two sons die? It makes no difference whether rangers are there or not. Things happen. The majority by far are safe, happy, free experience. Less rangers, less money to the park service, less government. Park service works for the people. Remember that.

Kenny Wells  
Salem, Missouri

I'm worried that the motor boat restriction on the upper current will impact trapping. Trapping is a legitimate use of the river. We use a motorboat to trap from Cedar Grove down to Pulltite. I'm not asking for a big motor. I've got a 20 horse on a Jon boat. Also gigging a lot of the - - a lot of the people have traditional uses. Trapping's one; gig's another. You're going to stop all that traditional use when you limit the motorboat use. Park service should recognize all traditional uses, camping, hunting fishing, trapping, gigging, all traditional uses that we've did for generations before the park service came about.

Mark Jackson  
Van Buren, Missouri

On the wilderness designated area, I don't agree with that. I think it's just a start to more, eventually just keep adding more and more until it's all wilderness and no one's allowed on the river. As far as the boat motor limitations, I think they're fine just the way they are. As far as camping out on the gravel bars, I think they're fine the way they are. I think we ought just stick to - - what is that - - no action alternative. I think that the zone areas on the river it would be a problem because of the people call things different things. Different people call different locations by different names, and posting them signs don't stay up on the river when flood - - during floods. It'll take a while for people to learn where the zones and areas were. Starting out it'd be a problem. I think eventually they would get to know where it's at. I think it'd cause a lot of conflict starting out.

Gary Garner  
Poplar Bluff, Missouri

I am supportive of the plan B. I'm an equestrian user, and I'd like to make sure that simultaneously with them closing down the non-designated trails that they would open up the trails that they're saying they're going to add so there's not a five-year gap or a ten-year gap, and the last plan they had had an equestrian campground suggested. And it never did happen, and it's been many years since this whole process came to be. And I - - there are many organizations. I'm in back country horseman myself that know that we can get grants to help out the National Park system put in something like that plus the labor that we can also add to that. We'd like to be a part of that. Then we're also kayakers, and our lives have been endangered as we tube and kayak by high powered boats. But I'm in favor of the areas of the river which can be non-motorized all times, you know, off and on peak season, so there's always a place to go for people that want the quiet on the river.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3074    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** Dear Secretary of the Interior:

I am concerned about the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.  
The Park Service should continue to manage these lands, and rivers.  
The Missouri congressmen are wrong to try to terminate the NPS' responsibilities.

Also, the various horse-trails should be kept as they are. The trail rides likely do less damage than the a t vees. And I hope the "wild horses" can live peacefully on these lands. (Maybe bears will keep their numbers down.)(Bears have been moving in to MO.)

june silverman  
Missouri voter  
St. Louis, MO

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3075    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Fax

**Correspondence:** It is the belief of the Eminence Area Chamber of Commerce, our members, our associates, and our community (based on facts by people who actually use the river ways), the Ozark National Scenic Riverways management does need change, but the vague, often-contradicting alternatives as presented are not the solution needed. The "No Action" Alternative use, as it currently applies to the ONSR management, should be extended until it is clear more of the advice, information, and commentary from the local and regional population are used in the plan alternatives. It is our opinion that rather than request "No Action" because we do not want e:xperiences within the beautiful boundaries of the ONSR limited, that we, in-fact, propose changes to further the visitor experience one may have in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, in and along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, and throughout the south central Missouri region. some contained in the proposed plans and others not.

The basic idea behind any of the necessity of implementing any of the suggestions for change to the management of



the ONSR is to create an experience akin to the core concept entailed with the inception and design of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. The thought processes behind these suggestions propose a set of changes not harking back to a time of better management, as when the Missouri State Parks managed the major springs in the area, nor to a time when the Federal Government owned no land in this region, but to offer a glimpse at what an experience in this region of unparalleled natural beauty should really be.

There are preservationists, whom want to limit access to this area whether because of strict beliefs, jealousy of accessibility, or because of a particular movement to make the ecology, environment, and life systems exist as they did before European explorers encountered this unique locale. This is based on a belief that humans had no interaction with the environment in this region, which is a falsehood. Land and water throughout the entire planet have had living inhabitants which have made some sort of impact on the environment. In this region, Native Americans lived here, both prior to and during the westward expansion of the Americas. So to restrict access and use of this place because humans never impacted the land, simply put, just does not make sense.

Understanding the land and making sound decisions in regards to its management is the best method to follow. Just as the Ozark National Scenic Riverways was founded in such a unique manner, so should it be managed.

Flagship NPS managed property. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways should be managed as a National Park Service flagship river way. Rather than forcing a relatively small park such as the ONSR to comply with federal standards for parks and river ways and monuments with very different purposes, needs, and resources, this Scenic Riverways should be managed as a flagship program-one that is a leader and innovator in programs for the Federal government. Changes include tailoring staff, resource use and management, cultural and heritage programs, visitor experience enhancement, as well as recreational opportunities to those actual visitors to the ONSR need and desire. The desires and needs of people who actually visit the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers is what was used to establish the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and these concepts should still be used in the management of it.

Stars Upstream and its author, why he argued for a recreational park. Although Leonard Hall was not a resident of the Eminence area, nor was he originally from this area, Leonard visited the Current and the Jacks Fork River watersheds quite often. It was documented through the local boat and canoe liveries that he came quite often and had a sincere interest in providing for the recreational experience of such a beautiful place as this. His book did argue through propaganda the area needed to be purchased by the government rather than owned by locals, using a few stock photos from area farms not near the rivers, but he used this propaganda for the reason that this area should be open to the public to enjoy, not shut off by a few, whether by mismanagement of the resource, by shutting down the public access by the wealthy elite, nor by placing a lake over this Ozark terrain.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways, in the arguments of proponents of a park, as opposed to the proponents of a lake, was to be an open recreational adventure, ready for the taking of anyone whom might choose to use it. It is not the purpose of the government nor those making rules to discriminate against any group when deciding public policy.

In an excerpt from attorney, Chris Yarbro, the following fairly describes the creation of The ONSR.

Recreational use was a material consideration during the creation of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR). The broad coalition that formed to preserve the Riverways from damming, split due to concerns surrounding intended uses of the Riverways. The initial proposal, the "Ozark National Monument", was unsuccessful in part for want of protection for recreational users. After its defeat, a second proposal, the "Ozark Scenic Riverways" proposal, was given consideration.

In the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee's initial report on the Ozark Scenic Riverways proposal, the committee emphasized the Importance of creating Federal recreational areas" and noted the Riverways' geographic location was uniquely situated for the same. Additionally, the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L Udall, reassured the committee and federal law makers that "recreation is a purpose" of the Ozark Scenic Riverways proposal.

With the committee's support, and Secretary Udall's reassurance, the Ozark Scenic Riverways was passed into law with the new title "Ozark National Scenic Riverways." The stated purpose of the newly created ONSR was:

For the purpose of conservation and interpreting unique scenic and other natural values and objects of historic interest, including preservation of portions of the Current River and the Jacks Fork River in Missouri as free flowing streams, preservation of springs and caves, management of wildlife, and provisions for use and enjoyment of the outdoor recreation resources thereof by the people of the United States...

Significantly, the ONSR's enabling act places recreational use on equal footing with the other stated purposes.

ONSR enabling legislation. The enabling legislation establishing the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, rather than simply the Ozark National Monument or a lake in this region, plans for a park which allows the public to enjoy the beautiful natural wonders near and along the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers. Each sentence of the enabling legislation describes a venture between the Federal, State, County, and City Governments as well as organizations from the region near the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. It in fact states such a fact so clearly that the blatant ignorance for opinions for the local and regional populace in the current plans for the ONSR makes such a process for drafting plans one-sided and should be reconsidered. It is the intent of the enabling legislation to give the population residing in and around the Ozark National Scenic Riverways input in the management of such an integral part of the economy and lifestyle of the south central Missouri Ozarks. Preservation for the sake of preservation and the ideal of a select few should not dictate what the visitors in the ONSR encounter when pursuing recreational activities.

Advisory Commission. An advisory commission, such as the one that was created for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways during the formative years of the park, should be reinstated to provide much-needed oversight for the National Park Service's management of the ONSR.

It is the belief that we should have an advisory board of people in similar fashion as the one for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways that was set up in the enabling legislation of the ONSR in 88-492, which also expired 10 years after the formation of the park, that has been prevalent for many years. It is not unusual for a Federal government agency or entity to have an oversight committee and it is very apparent, especially with the federal tax dollars spent on the General Management Plan draft process, that the ONSR needs exactly that, an advisory and oversight committee. The advisory and oversight committee should be set up in similar fashion to the original advisory committee that was created with the ONSR enabling legislation, but it should have the capabilities to carry out and suggest implementation of policies regardless of the request of the Secretary of the Interior. This should be an ongoing and continuing committee of people to aid in the management of the National Park System management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways-in so doing, the management process would already take into consideration the opinion of the stakeholders for the Current and Jacks Fork River watersheds. This would not only be a time saver, but would save immeasurable dollars spent on the GMP drafting process.

As formed during the creation of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, there was one member appointed from each of the county commissions in which the ONSR is located, Shannon, Dent., Carter, and Texas, as well as two appointed by the Governor of Missouri and one appointee from the Secretary of the Interior. The one issue with the legislation forming this advisory committee was the Secretary of the Interior was allowed to use them at his or her discretion and really an oversight committee should not be used at the leisure of the agency, it should be the oversight committee that reviews policy, practices, and management procedures of such an agency as the NPS and ONSR continually and regularly. It is also our understanding that other agencies of the US government have oversight and advisory committees with real power to suggest policies and help enforce them in the management of the agency.

Campsite Reservation System. Campsite reservations are a common complaint and factor requiring the chamber to make a statement specifically about the disorganization of the present system. It is understood that the NPS presumably pursued using the current campsite reservation system to save money and resources for other ventures within the park. However, the current campsite reservation system saves no money, in fact the current system, shuns away visitors. Since there a~ no way to make reservations locally nor to track: reservations on a local level, campsites remain vacant and are not filled. for example, if a visitor reserves a campsite and does not arrive at the agreed-upon time to maintain the reservation, that campsite is not filled and that campsite is not able to be filled because the system does not account for such actions. When one arrives at a campsite where there a~ no cell phone towers, no public telephones, nor access to the internet, the local ranger station cannot even help with this venture because the Omaha office must be called and directed through a prompt system that not only confuses, but deters visitors. This is a prime example of visitor deterrent policies.

In fact, some services for the smaller campgrounds have been removed, yet fees are still charged, despite the lack of a trash pick-up service. If it is necessary to raise fees for camping to provide services for the campsites and to maintain the unique visitor experience, then fees should be raised to accommodate visitors for the campsites they wish to use rather than simply eliminating the services for one campsite [ineligible text]. This is a general trend for the National Park Service management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and this management style should cease and desist as it currently exists.

In fact the campsite reservation system should not be held by a Canadian company for the ONSR, specifically, and move to a local position in order to fund a job, and use the \$9.00 surcharge for making a camping reservation to fund that position. Last minute reservations should be allowed for every campsite, without respect to any 7 day advance reservation policy. Campsites should be allowed to be in place for more than 2 weeks at a time, due to the nature of traditional camping activities. In fact, the ONSR camping system should be modelled after the system at some of Missouri's State Parks, where reservations abound throughout the year and tourists and locals alike are waiting in line for reservations. By creating a system similar to that of the one at some of Missouri's State Parks, the reservation position within the ONSR will pay for itself. The campsite system should be tailored to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, rather than tailoring the needs and wants of a much smaller park to those of the giant parks like Yellowstone. The size of this comparatively smaller riverways park system is one that prompts a camping plan which allows for the type of camping that visitors desire and need, rather than complying with and adhering to the policies of larger parks.

Large Boulders and other pieces of obstructive objects, 80oulders and travel-restrictive objects placed In and clang stream beds, creeks, and riverways are actually detrimental to the ecosystem of the rivers and encourage erosion. Such environmentally detrimental obstructions change the flow of the rivers and streams around which they are placed worse than the supposed activities which they were meant to prohibit. The best plan possible would be to partner with other agencies tie. the Army Corps of Engineers) to secure river banks and stream banks with protective materials and native plants so that erosion is minimized. This would protect not only the visitor experience, but also the wildlife and plants from erosive effects.

Gravel bar camping. An activity which is a traditional use pattern with no substantiated claims of environmental degradation is vehicular accessed gravel bar camping. This form of camping also helps to alleviate camping at less primitive campsites with more services. In fact, to increase some of the drive-in camping spots at current locations and to improve those sites would enhance the visitor experience and provide for more and different forms of camping that have very little impact on the environment. Basically, drive-in camping is a local and regional resident tradition for many families for generations. Prior to the establishment of the ONSR, extended friends and relatives would come visit this area and stay for weeks at a time to enjoy the pleasures of vacationing in and along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. Prior to European settlement, even the Osage used various spots along whit is now the ONSR as hunting camps to refuel and recharge while gathering food for their tribe. Although the Osage did not drive-in to camping locations, it would be assumed that not every one of them arrived to their spot by watercraft.

Canoes, Tubes, Rafts, Horseback Riding, and Jet Boats. It is integral to the economy of the area that access is kept for our canoe outfitters, our horseback riders, and our outboard motor visitors. The experience the groups have should be enhanced, improved, and considered when drafting the management plan, rather than placing limits and restrictions on the recreation they enjoy. It is illegal to double charge horseback trailriders to use the horse trails. Campsites and services for our campers, who prefer public campgrounds, whether large or small, should be improved. Today, people are mobile. Everyone has access to vehicular transportation, so if a tourist does not have a good experience here in the ONSR, they can choose to go elsewhere.

Position on "zoning" of rivers and lands. In the enabling legislation, it is cited that zoning is allowed for the management of wildlife and hunting, in relation to the enjoyment of visitors, public safety, administration and must consult the Missouri Conservation Commission for such topics of discussion. Zoning for the sake of copying urban-planning models is not described in the parks founding documents.

Conservation Commission's comment from 2009. There are a few basic concepts that will be exemplified by excerpts from this letter. First, in paragraph 3, page 1, "The Department recommends hunting, fishing, and trapping continue to be allowed throughout the ONSR" This statement clearly should alert the National Park Service to the necessity of keeping access available to the public for the purpose of wildlife management-in fact, this might be a good reason to expand upon the current access points, campsites, and roads along the riverways for that express purpose.

On page 2, in paragraph 1, they state, "Any discussion of boat motor horsepower limits would be incomplete without consideration of the impacts of proposed changes on angler access and fish communities. Zoning based on horsepower dictates where certain boats can gig or fish. Some areas of the river will receive more or less harvest pressure and a corresponding shift in fish community". The thought that there will be fish not ever touched or encountered by a jet boat or even by a fisherman is a nice thought to some who wish for no one to enjoy the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, but from a practical standpoint of Resource Management, the rivers should be fished and gilled to help maintain proper fish populations. It is the express concern of the Missouri Department of Conservation to manage the state's wildlife, fish, and forest resources, so their experience and professional opinion should be used for management purposes. As far as the fishing and gilling are concerned with completely zoning out jet boat transportation along the riverways, this same management tactic would apply. The river needs to have fishing and gilling in order to manage fish species.

Further in the letter the Commission states to, "upgrade the existing camping facilities and day-use facilities to attract and encourage families and children to experience nature in the great outdoors." This coincides with the notion the NPS should improve current accesses, campsites, and facilities to enhance the visitor experience, rather than shut down, close, and block access to resources. In the letter they also state they support the "No Action plan with a few minor provisions-it is quite evident the National Park Service has ignored official comment from the Missouri Department of Conservation in the current draft plan (an agency to which the ONSR is bound to cooperate with by the enabling legislation) as well as local comments.

Access for the purpose of Wildfire management. It is imperative that because the National Park Service makes no attempts at forest management that every road, trail, and transportation avenue be left open within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for wildfire prevention and management. Although we have not had wildfires in this region for a number of years, that is thanks in part to the preventative efforts of management agencies such as the Missouri Department of Conservation and the US Forest Service. The roads as they presently exist represent years of travel as established presumably by some of the Native Americans and later travelled by the European settlers and pioneers. Eventually the roads and trails that are left today represent a cultural and historical lesson to the student and to the visitor. However, the important lesson to be learned is to allow for proper wildfire management so the entire stand of forest does not burn down. Additionally, such libelous behavior endangers the residents of the region with the likelihood of a wildfire reaching homes and more populated areas due to the unmanaged forest. Roads and trails provide more than leisure activity, they provide a lifeline to wildfire management

Access for Emergency personnel and management. Closing access points along the riverways is a counterproductive notion when considering the needs of emergency management. If people are injured, have an accident, encounter an issue and need help, it is very important that emergency management personnel are able to access the creeks, rivers, and lands in and along the ONSR.

Access for elderly, the very young, and the disabled. It is a common theme among the federal government at this time that access to federally owned properties (ie. Courthouses, agency offices, public works buildings, public monuments in urban areas, property held in trust for public use), no matter what a person's age, creed, nationality, sex, color, ability, disability, and other descriptive devices used to categorize people and prevent them from accessing what should be available to all people. It is a basic ideal that is embedded in policy, legislation, regulations, and practices carried out by the Federal government-the idea that discrimination toward a segment of society, especially if that segment of society is underprivileged, under-represented, and lacks resources.

It should be noted that by limiting access to campsites only to those who can travel on the river is discriminating against those who cannot ride in a watercraft. Access to gravel bar camping should be allowable by those who can travel by a land operated vehicle-which allows access to the elderly, the very young, and the disabled.

By limiting motorized boat access on certain points of the river, it is not only a discriminatory act against the above-mentioned groups, it is also a self-regulating zoning conversation. Jet boats will not travel on stretches of water where there is insufficient water to travel. During seasons when there is sufficient water in the river to allow jet boat travel, there should be no restrictions. There should be no restrictions in order to allow for the travel of the elderly, the very young, and the disabled to spots of historic, cultural, and natural beauty interest just like anyone else who wants to visit the spot that can travel by foot or a method that is non-restrictive to those in the minority groups aforementioned. Additionally, the National Park Service has questionable jurisdiction over navigable rivers, no matter whether they fall onto the lands owned by the Federal government. So any limitations placed on jet boats or watercrafts have an equally questionable ability to be enforced.

Access for graveyards and cemeteries. This issue pertains to that of road and trail closures. In a group meeting held in Rolla, Missouri, the Missouri Coalition for the Environment proposed that 64 "illegal" roads and trails be closed due to the fact that these roads and trails contribute to the presence of gravel, through environmental erosion, in the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, which lie within the ONSR. There are three arguments which discount this claim which cites these roads and trails should be closed. First, these roads and trails are not illegal, nor are they new; every road and trail that exists that is claimed to be illegal is a road or trail based from use patterns that exist since European settlement of this area. This information is based on a road and trail study performed in the 1980s which stated these roads and trails are illegal because the National Park Service did not account for them when the ONSR was being formed. This is in fact a fallacy. The NPS, simply put, did not desire for these roads and trails to be accounted for, so they left them out of the original documents describing county roads. This was furthered by the roads and trails study performed in the 1980s. Once this was created, the roads and trails that are now being said to be illegal, some of which are slated to be closed, have actually been in existence prior to the formation of the ONSR.

Additionally, the Missouri Coalition for the Environment and the National Park Service are basing the decisions to close roads and trails on data gathered from studies which is skewed, and non-existent in some cases. There is no proven point of entry into the water system for the gravel which appears in the riverbeds today. There are many theories about this subject, however, none are accepted as being the authoritative theory for where the gravel in the rivers originate. The roads and trails are desired to be closed simply because there is a belief among some environmental groups that access to natural resources such as those that exist in the ONSR should be closed off, exclusive only to use patterns approved by them-a privilege, in a sense. This is why they push to close these roads and trails. Furthermore, they wish to close off access at the ends of county roads which allow the public to access the river, which is problematic for many reasons, including access for the handicapped, the very young, and the elderly, in addition to emergency management, wildfire management, traditional use

patterns, and access to the cultural, natural, and historic locations as set forth in the enabling legislation.

Another point to be considered for the argument to keep the roads open is access to cemeteries, graveyards, and gravesites. Most of the roads and trails within the ONSR lead to a burial site of a local family which resided at that location prior to the establishment of the ONSR. It is very important to the residents of our communities that they be able to access and to visit their family burial plots located at their old homeplaces along the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers. It is cited in the "Management Policies 2006: The Guide to Managing the National Park System- (produced by the National Park Services in section 8.6.10, that burials will be allowed to be visited by family members or designees. It is important to not cut off the heritage and culture of people from visiting their ancestors at their old homeplaces. Graveyards and grave sites should be given the respect to allow descendants to visit the resting places of loved ones and ancestors, regardless of policy or regulations.

Timber management. Simply stated, a timber management policy of selective cutting, even highly selective cutting would be a wildfire-prevention method. a stimulus to the local and regional economy, as well as provide for safety management for visitors. The NPS could partner with government agency, for example the Missouri Department of Conservation, to actively manage the timber and wildlife resources. Just as it is important to have existing and longstanding forests for animal habitat, it is equally as important to have different stages of the forest to encourage various wildlife populations to flourish and inhabit these managed forests. We do not desire to have visitors of the ONSR to encounter stages of the forest which are cleared or unattractive, which was the sentiment of ONSR proponents and congressional officials at the time of inception and is why the original purchase of land included a corridor of land nestled only next to the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers in most places. This was to control the visitor experience and allow them to see natural beauty from their trip on the rivers. But it is imperative to have forest and resource management for the purpose of wildfire prevention. wildlife proliferation, stable environment conditions, and an enhanced visitor experience.

The basic concepts behind timber management include wildfire prevent, traditional fire patterns the Native Americans applied to the region (which was the environment documented by Henry Rowe Schoolcraft). ecological (meaning ecosystem degradation and regeneration is part of the natural forest and fauna life cycle), as well as economic.

Gravel removal. According to the plan on page 241, "Gravel mining operations can adversely affect the geology of adjacent tributaries by altering flow patterns. changing channel structure. increasing stream gradient, relocating channels, and causing scouring and bank erosion." This notation does not take into account the necessity for the gravel to be removed as part of a cyclical process. There are no reports, studies, tests, nor hypotheses which prove where the gravel in the river comes from. Frank Hughes, a local scientist and resident. once stated, "that it is very likely the gravel is a cyclical trend and in order to manage it, the gravel must be mined to protect the wildlife and fish, so the streams do not fill up and choke out all the wildlife." Although this alters what the present state is of the river.; it is a process which the local residents have operated since settlement. These patterns help protect the fish and wildlife to ensure there is a future for them. as opposed to a dry creek bed filled with gravel.

It is very clear, the management of this park should be proactive, rather than laissez faire. The lack of interest by the NPS management of the ONSA extends beyond the gravel, but encompasses tourist information, assistance, and general visitor experiences. Meaning, the NPS does very little to assist the tourist or visitor, except in the form of inspecting and writing tickets..

System of computerized paperwork for park rangers so they may be visible, rather than combative toward visitors. Combative and harassing park rangers is the number one deterrent to recreational experiences in the ONSR, second only to the negative publicity from the ONSR. It is integral in management of this riverways system to have park service employees and rangers to be visible for assistance, information, and to provide a positive presence within the system as far as visitor experiences is concerned. It is not intended for the National Park Service to employ more rangers, more employees, nor additional staff in any form to provide these services, but it is intended to shift the NPS

from spying activities on visitors and trying to "catch them in the act" of performing illegal or citation-worthy activities. It is meant to provide a regulatory presence. The purpose of NPS staff is to provide help to visitors within the riverways and to enhance the visitor experience. In so-doing, the employees will not prohibit activities by citations, but encourage good behavior of visitors by appearing in uniform throughout the system in a capacity design to assist visitors.

Local cultural and heritage aspects-discrimination and degradation. When the United States government purchased our river frontage, springs, and significant cultural structures, which is the most valuable land and resources in the immediate area, they promised to protect the history, heritage and culture of our river communities. Through a process that negated that promise, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways destroyed homes, barns, outbuildings and other structures of highly significant value, both worthy to keep for posterity and for the sake of our culture and heritage. Fields, most of which were promised to be cared for in the same manner they were left, in order to show what working farms were of the current time and those of the past, to grow over. The experience of people to view life as it was in river communities of the day was severely altered and detrimentally impacted. These concepts were as much a part of the visitor experience as the purely natural beauty in and along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers.

It is peculiar that once again the National Park Service seeks to protect our culture and heritage, interpret and catalog the society that once was and further push our culture to the break of collapse. This form of discrimination is the ultimate detriment to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. It is one that, under the guise of protecting the environment, they close off access, further discourage people to visit their ancestral homeplaces, and limit the ability of all people, regardless of race, creed, color, culture, access to resources, and ability to fight this cultural slaughter, to truly enjoy what the unique experience is of going to and becoming one with the waters and lands in and along the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

Necessity of management during government shutdown. It became glaringly apparent during the government shutdown of 2013, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways needs to have legislation passed to protect the resource and to protect the rights of the people to access public property, which is owned by the people. There should be no citations issued, no scary signs prohibiting access placed-the park should have legislation in place to allow people to access and to use the resource, if not managed by the Federal government employees during the shutdown, then most certainly managed by employees of the State of Missouri, whether by the Missouri Department of Conservation, the Missouri Department of Natural Resources, or by a joint venture between the two. There are examples of similar legislation to keep the park open such as the Washington monument in Washington, DC, and examples from the State of Utah where state employees managed federally owned lands during the shutdown. Similar legislation should be passed, not only to protect the rights of the people, but so that the economy of our region is not further diminished by the actions of the Federal government.

Legislation to protect activities in and along the ONSR. If it were the intention of those who lobbied to create the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to establish a park where there are no recreational activities allowed, then it would have been set forth to create a park designed to limit visitor activities, focus only on wildlife and fish and plants and other living inhabitants of the ONSR, besides humans, and create a park, for the knowledge that someone in St. Louis can strong-arm the National Park Service into shutting down access to this region so they feel comfort in the solitude of the plants and animals here. However, they did not. It was meant, by Secretary Udall, Congressman Ichord, and author Leonard Hall, to have a recreational area-one where people can enjoy the resources, both historical from human habitation as well as natural.

Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968. In accordance with the following statement taken directly from [rivers.gov](http://rivers.gov), the government interpretation encourages use of input from the visitors and resource users from the area near the ONSR and encourages the general management plan to more greatly consider the enabling legislation:

Regardless of classification, each river in the National System is administered with the

goal of protecting and enhancing the values that caused it to be designated, Designation neither prohibits development nor gives the federal government control over private property. Recreation, agricultural practices, residential development, and other uses may continue. Protection of the river is provided through voluntary stewardship by landowners and river users and through regulation and programs of federal, state, local, or tribal governments.

Points from the Plan Draft:

Management of "degradation of water resources in the National Riverways from land-based recreation would continue to be managed on a site-by-site, case-by-case basis."

It is clearly stated on page 242 of the GMP, "When the likely effects of the no-action alternative are added to the effects of the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, there would be a long-term, moderate, adverse, regional cumulative impact on soils and geologic resources. The "no-action alternative would contribute to an appreciable, long-term, adverse increment to the cumulative effect." In summary, by managing in the present status, the natural resources would be detrimentally affected, which could impact the region for a fairly long time. This statement is based on skewed data, used only by the NPS to shut-off access and use of the resource to make the management of this park closer to the idea of preservationist propaganda. Based on the fact that data gathered and used for the park service studies and results are skewed, thus, null and void the premise that these resources need to be shut-off is also null and void.

Equestrian pursuits mentioned on pages 252, 253. Studies that have tried to prove adverse effects to the environment from equestrian pursuits have been both skewed and shown to be invalid.

Municipal wastewater discharges on page 253. The City of Eminence is currently in compliance with State and Federal agencies. They have recently completed a community public water project. The city is proactively pursuing keeping the river clean through proper management of the city water and sewer system. "'Keeping our rivers clean" is part of the motto of the city water projects.

Vegetation on page 263- 264. Vegetation along undesignated roads and trails is not trampled in such a manner as to disturb the plant life in any significant way. It is clear by visiting a road or a trail to see these recreational activities taking place on them do not, in any way, shape, or form, disturb the ecology nor cause detrimental environmental impact so as to substantiate placing it in this document.

Wildlife & Fish on page 276. Some claims are made in this section which related river crossings, jet-boats, undesignated roads and trails, and "motorboat-based petroleum pollutants" as causing "water quality degradation and having adverse effects on aquatic habitat. As discussed earlier, studies and data related to pollution have been proven to be skewed and incorrect as far as land-based recreation is concerned. In relation to jet boats "California Standards" apply to the jet boats, which places minute parts per million of pollutants into the water. There were no studies proving that the jet boats had a detrimental effect on the rivers nor the fish nor wildlife. Erosion does not happen from boats, but from the floods that occur naturally. So if it were proven that detrimental effects to the water quality does not happen due to these activities, it should be safe to say that recreational activities within the ONSR do not degrade the aquatic habitat.

Ozark Hellbender. As discussed by a National Geographic study recently published online through the Smithsonian Institute, "Snot Otters Slipping Away", ambient temperature of the water affects reproductive cycle of the Hellbender. This should be attributed to the increase in the ambient temperature of the air and the importance of environmental factors from other parts of the country, as the water and lands in this part of the Ozarks are well cared for. Another attributable factor is the increased number of bass in the river eating the young Hellbenders, which substantiates furthering the unregulated use of jet boat on the riverways, which would allow continued traditional fishing patterns.

280 1st paragraph, discussion on human interaction with plants and animals. The impact of humans to the ONSR is negligible in this discussion as humans have, for at least a few thousand years, been



involved in the environment of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers, and should continue to be allowed to be a part of the resources here.

Cultural Resources discussion on page 307. Interestingly enough, cultural resources, as it relates to those with long-time connections to the land and water, in addition to those whom have acquired a connection to the land and water through their interest in History, Anthropology, the Sciences, or Socio-Environmental studies, refer to any number of old homeplaces, remnants of structures, former community hubs, schoolhouses, campsites, name-places on the rivers and streams - even when someone has an unique experience at one of these locations without a prior knowledge of the location can inspire this connection - and natural wonders associated with the culture. It is tradition through Native American and European cultures to visit ancestrally connected locations, in fact it appears in several cultures besides the two mention (but these two are relevant for this discussion). The simplest notion of visiting the location where a baby in the family died and was buried on an old farm can represent this connection to the land.

It has been said that this dirt and these waters run through the veins of the people with this connection to the water and land, and so it is impossible to truly separate them from this area. Which, in the process of limiting access and use to any point through the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, it is in fact degrading, discounting, and providing a detrimental effect to the local and regional culture. Although it may also be said that people come from every state in the United States to visit their ancestral homelands here in the ONSR.

To select areas to shut off access and use, to limit regardless of handicap, ability, age, socioeconomic level, or connection to influential public officials, is to commit the highest form of an act of discrimination - essentially, this is denial of access to one's heritage and culture.

Historic Buildings and Structures discussion on pages 313- 316. It should be the duty of the National Park Service to maintain, catalog, interpret, and provide public Information about the culture, history, historic structures, and other parts of life in the past and present in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Historic structures should not be limited to those whom are not disabled, very young, or elderly. Present accommodations for travel to historic structures and locations should, in fact, be increased and accessibility be better maintained, it is impossible to consider making changes to the current management patterns of the historic structures as it is proposed in the General Management plan when it is purported by ONSR staff that there is not sufficient funding to sustain the existing structures, interpretive programs, and cultural activities that are currently needed.

Ethnographic Impact on pages 322-324. It is presumed that when stating Ethnography, it is not necessarily referring to the culture, biology, social branches of anthropological study of a group in the past -tense. In fact, in the case of the study, understanding, and interpretation of ethnography for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, the ethnography of the group about which they study and promote, is the same group it has sought for many years to dose off cultural, social, and literally biologically connected sites along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. In fact, it should be taken into consideration when mentioning protecting the rights of Native Americans to access and to use their tribal lands, that most of the families which settled and lived along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers had Native American ancestry, many times very recent. Most of the residents were of the Cherokee Tribe, however there were many other tribes represented in that group -as prevalent as this topic is, it should be noted that ancestral access to the regions Native American population should not be shut off, bottled up, and held for only a few to view, study, and ponder.

Wilderness designation recommendation - fiscal responsibility. It is a travesty that the National Park Service has actually spent the insurmountable amount of money they have on the General Management Plan process when this could have been so easily addressed with the Advisory/Oversight Committee as mentioned above, in this case, specifically in relation to the Wilderness Study. It is prevalent, even from the presentation provided by the ONSR during the comment period public forum discussions, that it is not and will not be foreseeably possible for a Wilderness designation to be obtained for any section of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers watersheds due to the process involved to establish such a

designation. Considering the budgetary cuts to providing services and offering proper number of staff for recreational activities within the: ONSR, this money should have been more responsibly managed.

Chambers take on the economy and how the ONSR impacts it. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways has had a mixed review of impact on the counties it is located in. Rather than bringing up historical impacts the NPS had on the resident population of these counties, let's discuss current impact in relation to the impact from recent history. Shannon County, the second largest in acreage in the State of Missouri, is the poorest county per-capita in the entire state. Shannon County is traditionally the county in the state with the fewest resources and is highly isolated, in terms of economics, travel patterns, communication, representation in the government, and education. The county has a majority of the land owned by the LAD Foundation, the State of Missouri, and the US Government. This negatively impacts education, public services, government representation, resident population, job opportunities, and the economy. In-lieu-of-tax payments are substandard and are in no way comparable to what should be paid to the Shannon County government and to our schools. Jobs, that upon the establishment of the ONSR, were explained would be given to locals have been outsourced, whether to Canada for camping reservations, residents of other counties in order to substantiate an impact on a region for payroll, rather than the counties in which the ONSR resides, or that locals are not to be hired because of the idea that Federal employees should not work in career jobs for a Park Service managed property. In being a community member, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is lacking in several aspects, including consideration for publicity and now negative public statements affect the economy negatively, how giving unwarranted citations to park visitors sends tourist dollars away from this area, dollars that are vital to the economy, or when rules and regulations are whimsically applied to appease the section of environmentalists from St. Louis County that have the ear of the Park Service administration in Van Buren and Omaha.

Positive impacts upon the local population are created when visitors have a good experience in the ONSR and do not have to battle superfluous regulations, combative government employees, and ease of access to the resources, both natural and cultural, and use of the resource as traditionally experienced. This process does happen, but we can make the experience even more productive and fruitful for the visitors of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers' watersheds by truly enhancing the visitor experience. The tourist economy is vital to Shannon County, since the land for which productive use for economic activities is owned by the aforementioned entities. Tourism is vital to the economy for many reasons, it not only brings income into the county, but also helps to increase the services of the residents of the county as the tourist need access to those various services as well. Tourists are not only from throughout the nation, but we have local and regional residents that we might consider in the tourist category, this is a definite impact on the economy.

It cannot be overstated how important tourism is to the economy of Shannon County and it should be the duty of the National Park Service to work with our county to improve tourism in this region, rather than to squash and starve the resident population with superfluous rules and regulations.

Plan B Commentary. On page ii of the NPS Summary of Key Concepts for the ONSR General Management plan, Alternative B (which is the Park Service preferred plan) is described that it will "enhance opportunities for visitors to discover and learn about the natural wonders and Ozark heritage of the National riverways, while maintaining a mix of traditional recreational and commercial activities." We beg to differ on the idea this plan will enhance activities and provide for traditional recreational experiences in many ways. To begin with, there is nothing to be gained from zoning areas and closing off use and limiting use for the traveler, except to enhance the notion that a limited number of people can access the riverways. Additionally, the concept of traditional use is obviously a vision the National Park Service does not share with those whom participate in the traditional recreational activities, because the agency has continually sought to limit access, use, and participation in the riverways, whether because of preservationist doctrine, lack of funding, appeal to particular interest groups, or to make it easier for them to manage fewer people with fewer resources. It is however, not the purpose of the National Park Service management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to limit access and use to cultural and natural resources, nor should it be their goal to limit the economic resources available to the resident population,

People, after reading, reviewing, attending public comment forums, and speaking with NPS personnel about the GMP draft, Question how the NPS can afford to build and maintain a new learning center and other costly proposals in the plan which would require expenditures above what is publicized cannot be afford to be spent to pay for current staff and maintenance.

#### Summary and Conclusion.

Through the discussion of the benefits of using more public input from the actual users, visitors, 0100 residents of the neighboring area, it should be plain to understand the ONSR should make changes, but in a much different manner than is proposed in any of the GMP Alternatives. Even the plan of "No Action" does not address the proper concerns enough; it is however, recommended the National Park Service mandate the use of the "No Action" plan alternative until it is evident more practical and useful changes are made to the alternatives as present ed. One way to best understand a method that would steer the organization in the right direction is the establishment of an Advisory/Oversight Committee spelled out above. This could certainly alleviate some of the concerns all stakeholders have.

One very peculiar topic of concern is that of overcrowding along the rivers. To establish a blanket policy across the ONSR to limit activities, access, recreation, and the desire to return to this riverways because of overcrowding along the rivers that occurs a few days a year is utterly and unmistakably a point that proves an oversight committee needs to be established. There are many points along the riverways where people can travel even when there is overcrowding in certain sections of the river where solitude and serenity may be found. Similar to the management of the roads and highways of this nation, it is not their policy to close down sections of the sections of roads most highly used, it is their practice to improve access, resources, and availability for those who wish to travel to be unimpeded. We are in no way suggesting support for environmental degradation due to an overabundance of humans, but at this time there are no worries of this happening. The basic concept to comprehend here is that through a little better management of resources, improved access points, additional bathrooms, better services, many of these concerns can be addressed.

Addressing concerns should, additionally, not be just those concerns of particular interest groups with money, ready access to education and to other resources, such as those environmental groups which desire to shut off access to our cultural heritage-concerns should be addressed for those that actually use the riverways, quite literally assist in the cleanup of the system, protect the environment by individual actions and group actions, and have a year-long interest in the subject, not just those who find interest in this when an email is sent out from an organization with paid staff, lawyers on retainer, and a desire to further limit an entire group of people's rights.

Each topic of discussion here should lead the reader to better understand the necessity of a flagship management program to enhance visitor experiences. Expansion of access and use to create a positive visitor experience is integral to the economy of this region, but commerce is also how the government receives their funding. To limit and to chain commerce to a point where it is not possible by the government is a self-defeating purpose. We request the Secretary of Interior to cease and desist discriminatory practices against the people in and around the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. And we ask to have more and better access to the resources, more reasonable local input placed into the management of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, assistance with legislation to protect the true needs of the users of the ONSR, to follow the intended use of the ONSR in accordance with the enabling legislation, to implement a plan to keep the park open during another government shutdown, and to institute an Advisory/Oversight Committee formed in similar fashion as the enabling legislation entails but with more powers to ensure decisions by the committee make an impact.

Eminence Area Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors and undersigned supporters.  
January 27, 2014

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3076	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,20,2013 00:00:00				

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Michael,

First and foremost, I want to thank you and your staff for releasing a General Management Plan that offers substantial improvements in protections for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I just submitted our organization's official comment on the plan and I'm looking forward to the public hearings in early January. I'm writing today as the official representative of Environment Missouri and Environment Missouri Research and Policy Center to request that you do not extend the public comment period for the draft GMP past February 7th, 2014.

We agree that pushing the public hearings into January was a prudent move given the weather in Southeastern Missouri earlier this month, and we think it entirely reasonable that the comment period be extended for a month after the public hearings to give individuals and groups the chance to thoroughly develop and articulate their thoughts on the GMP.

However, it has come to our attention that organizations and individuals, all of whom appear to be in complete opposition to a management plan of any sort, are agitating for a further extension in the comment period.

We believe that this is just a stalling tactic and that those who are asking for the extension are merely seeking more time in which to figure out how to delay, hinder or derail the GMP process. This is a blatant subversion of the rationale behind public comment periods and shows complete disrespect and disregard of the National Park Service's mission to protect and preserve the places that make America so special. For the sake of the park, and all Americans who believe in the great work that you do, please refuse any requests for further extensions of the comment period.

Sincerely and with great appreciation,

Stuart P. Keating  
State Advocate  
Environment Missouri

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3077 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Jan,15,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** Thank you for all your hard work scheduling the Draft General Management Plan meetings/ I appreciate you postponing them due to inclement weather.

I anticipate better weather soon and look forward to attending these important meetings.

Grace and Peace  
Jeff Pogue

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3078 **Project:** 15793 **Document:** 56208

**Received:** Dec,13,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Director Jarvis:

Regarding the proposed General Management Plan (GMP) of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR), we have concerns that the National Park Service has not taken into great enough account the input from directly impacted citizens who live, use, and work along the Riverways.

Our goal is to provide citizens with a variety of recreational opportunities while continuing to preserve and protect the economic, natural, and cultural resources of the ONSR for future generations. The current proposals under the new GMP do not address our primary concern:

Tourism is one of the most critical components of our rural economy and the ONSR is the primary attraction. Thousands of out-of-state as well as in-state hikers, campers, boaters, hunters, fishermen and horseback riders visit this area annually and bring many irreplaceable dollars when they come. Any further limitations on the access to these assets would severely impact this local economy.

While our legislative delegation agrees we need to protect the ONSR, we must not overlook our citizens' heritage

and livelihood. We were disappointed that your initial review period had only two open houses for citizens to give their input. Only one of those meetings is located in the region; the other was in St. Louis, which is 150 miles away.

Providing directly impacted citizens with an opportunity to have input on this critical issue is essential for the success and future management of the ONSR. The economic and cultural importance of the ONSR to families and small businesses in Missouri will be threatened if the "NPS Preferred Alternative" is implemented. It appears that the goal of this plan is to shutdown public access points to the rivers, eliminate motorized boat traffic from certain areas, further restrict boat motor horsepower in other areas, close several gravel bars, and propose additional areas to be designated as federal wilderness. We are adamantly opposed to all of these proposals, as are our constituents and business owners.

We support the "No-Action Alternative" to the current operating system. The ONSR value to the region is unparalleled. Do not adopt a GMP that is contrary to our wishes, those of our constituents, and the other folks who depend on access to the Riverways and cannot operate with additional government regulations. In our opinion, the ONSR is already over-managed with burdensome federal regulations. The Riverways support a vibrant and growing tourism industry that is critical to our region and state. We will continue to strongly advocate against further encroachment by the National Park Service limiting our citizens' access to public lands.

As you continue with the process, we hope you will consider our comments and those of the directly impacted citizens who will be affected by your actions.

Kindest regards,  
Holly Rehder  
State Representative  
District 148

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3079	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,08,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Mr. Reynolds:				

Thank you for your presentation on Nov. 6 regarding the proposed General Management Plan of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

Our goal is to provide citizens with a variety of recreational opportunities while continuing to preserve and protect the economic, natural and cultural resources of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for future generations. We believe that more public input is needed. The current proposals under the new General Management Plan do not address our primary concern:

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is vital to the continuing success of our local communities and economies. Tourism and economic development are essential to the future success of this treasure. Thousands make their way to this area to enjoy recreational activities, including boating, horseback riding, sightseeing and camping. Limiting, or even banning, some of these activities would be devastating to our communities that depend on these tourism dollars that support their schools and sorely needed jobs for their citizens.

While our legislative delegation representing the Ozark National Scenic Riverways agrees we need to protect this area, we must not overlook our citizens' heritage and livelihood. Following your presentation, we determined two public meetings are not enough for the National Park Service to realize the overall impact regarding any changes to a new General Management Plan would have on our region. Providing only two locations for public meetings does not give citizens enough time to provide their valuable comments on the draft plan by Jan. 8, 2014.

Additional meetings are needed at Salem, Eminence and Poplar Bluff, thus providing directly impacted citizens with an opportunity to have input. The locations selected in our region for your open houses will be at no cost to you.

Respectfully submitted,

Senator Doug Libla

Senator Mike Cumminigham

Representative Robert Ross

Representative Paul Fistzwater

Representative Todd Richardson

Representative Stephen Cookson

Representative Jeffrey Pogue

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3080	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,06,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Director Jarvis:				

Regarding the proposed General Management Plan (GMP) of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR), we have concerns that the National Park Service has not taken into great enough account the input from directly impacted citizens who live, use, and work along the Riverways.

Our goal is to provide citizens with a variety of recreational opportunities while continuing to preserve and protect the economic, natural, and cultural resources of the ONSR for future generations. The current proposals under the new GMP do not address our primary concern:

Tourism is one of the most critical components of our rural economy and the ONSR is the primary attraction. Thousands of out-of-state as well as in-state hikers, campers, boaters, hunters, fishermen and horseback riders visit this area annually and bring many irreplaceable dollars when they come. Any further limitations on the access to these assets would severely impact this local economy.

While our legislative delegation agrees we need to protect the ONSR, we must not overlook our citizens' heritage and livelihood. We were disappointed that your initial review period had only two open houses for citizens to give their input. Only one of those meetings is located in the region; the other was in St. Louis, which is 150 miles away.

Providing directly impacted citizens with an opportunity to have input on this critical issue is essential for the success and future management of the ONSR. The economic and cultural importance of the ONSR to families and small businesses in Missouri will be threatened if the "NPS Preferred Alternative" is implemented.

It appears that the goal of this plan is to shutdown public access points to the rivers, eliminate motorized boat traffic from certain areas, further restrict boat motor horsepower in other areas, close several gravel bars, and propose additional areas to be designated as federal wilderness. We are adamantly opposed to all of these proposals, as are our constituents and business owners.

We support the "No-Action Alternative" to the current operating system. The ONSR value to the region is unparalleled. Do not adopt a GMP that is contrary to our wishes, those of our constituents, and the other folks who depend on access to the Riverways and cannot operate with additional government regulations. In our opinion, the ONSR is already over-managed with burdensome federal regulations. The Riverways support a vibrant and growing tourism industry that is critical to our region and state. We will continue to strongly advocate against further encroachment by the National Park Service limiting our citizens' access to public lands.

As you continue with the process, we hope you will consider our comments and those of the directly impacted citizens who will be affected by your actions.

Sincerely,

Stephen C. Cookson  
153rd District Representative

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3081    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,20,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:**

Dear Michael,

First and foremost, I want to thank you and your staff for releasing a General Management Plan that offers substantial improvements in protections for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. I just submitted our organization's official comment on the plan and I'm looking forward to the public hearings in early January.

I'm writing today as the official representative of Environment Missouri and Environment Missouri Research and Policy Center to request that you do not extend the public comment period for the draft GMP past February 7th, 2014.

We agree that pushing the public hearings into January was a prudent move given the weather in Southeastern Missouri earlier this month, and we think it entirely reasonable that the comment period be extended for a month after the public hearings to give individuals and groups the chance to thoroughly develop and articulate their thoughts on the GMP.

However, it has come to our attention that organizations and individuals, all of whom appear to be in complete opposition to a management plan of any sort, are agitating for a further extension in the comment period.

We believe that this is just a stalling tactic and that those who are asking for the extension are merely seeking more time in which to figure out how to delay, hinder or derail the GMP process. This is a blatant subversion of the rationale behind public comment periods and shows complete disrespect and disregard of the National Park Service's mission to protect and preserve the places that make America so special. For the sake of the park, and all Americans who believe in the great work that you do, please refuse any requests for further extensions of the comment period.

Sincerely and with great appreciation,

Stuart P. Keating  
State Advocate  
Environment Missouri

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3082    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,13,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:**

Dear Director Jarvis,

I am deeply concerned with and disturbed by the "Draft General Management Plan" that was released Friday, November 8th, for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways ("ONSR"). Among other things, it appears that the goal of this plan is to shutdown public access points to the rivers, eliminate motorized boat traffic from certain areas, further restrict boat motor horsepower in other areas, close several gravel bars, and propose additional areas to be designated as federal wilderness. Mr. Director, I feel the need to personally, and formally, inform you that I am adamantly opposed to all of these proposals on behalf of my constituents and their local businesses.

Since its creation in 1964 as a demonstration park for the "Wild and Scenic Riverways" program the Ozark National Scenic Riverways has been a premier destination for tourists from Missouri, the United States, and even foreign countries. An economy has arisen locally from accommodating these visitors with food, lodging, and entertainment; including canoeing, horseback riding, and camping.

Traditionally, local individuals and businesses have been allowed to guide these tourists through the park, and provide them with valuable services. These folks are the backbone of our local economy. Further restricting access to the park, and possibly closing up to 90% of the public access points, is an extreme measure that looks punitive in nature. Preventing the use of motors on boats in certain areas, and limiting their power in others, will damage a local economy that is already the victim of burdensome federal regulations. The Draconian land use policies associated with Wilderness Areas are unwelcome additions to a Park that is well functioning and beloved by those of us who grew up here.

Your Park Service's attempts to restrict the public use of the park and threaten private landowner's property rights are well documented and have been at the forefront of this, my first term in Congress. They started with your Park Service's involvement with the National "Blueways" System and the (now defunct) designation of the "White River National Blueway," continued with the sudden requirement for a permit to perform a baptism, solidified with the ONSR's punitive preclusion policies during the shutdown, and are now popping up again with this draft General Management Plan.

In January of this year fourteen of the thirty counties in my district were included in the Blueways designation without having ever been contacted, and with no public meetings or information provided to them. As reprehensible as doing something like that was without public notice in the affected areas, even worse were some of the proposals in the plan itself that would have infringed on the property rights of area landowners. The Blueways plan called for the creation of 180' wide "buffer zones" that would have prevented farmers from using their land to graze and water cattle, and also for the acquisition of hundreds of thousands of acres of private property.

When local folks found out what was in the Blueways' program they were rightfully outraged. Why would the Park Service sign on to a proposal to take away private landowner's rights without even holding a public meeting?

In relation to the oversight of the Blueways program conducted by the House Natural Resources Committee, of which I am a member, I had the opportunity to discuss the White River National Blueway with Secretary Jewell in an open and public Congressional Hearing. At the end of our discussion, on July 17th, I expressed concerns about an upcoming General Management Plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Specifically, I informed the Secretary that I would not support any plan that limits access points, closes trails, lowers boat motor horsepower limits, bans motors on parts of the river where they are currently allowed, or proposes new wilderness areas. I realize that this administration has made it a habit of ignoring the wishes of Congress, but I would have hoped that at the very least when changes of this magnitude are proposed in a particular part of the country, in a specific congressional district, that the member's wishes would have at least warranted a response. I see now that my expectations were too high.

I spoke with you on October 16th in an open and public hearing about the sudden requirement in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways that churches wishing to perform baptisms must obtain permits. As I mentioned, the idea that individuals can party on the river, can swim in the river, can float the river, or perform any other lawful activity in the river without a permit but baptisms would require federal approval- is insane. I am troubled that the same Park Service that would seek to require permits for baptisms is now proposing a new General Management plan while ignoring the public comments that I made to Secretary Jewell.

During the Obama Administration's government shutdown, your Park Service refused to allow the Missouri Department of Conservation to open the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to the public, free of charge to the Federal Government. That land that now composes the park used to contain two state parks, and the state gave that land to the Federal Government with the hope that it would be preserved and protected for public use. Mr. Director, it was within your purview to allow the State to open the park back up; you chose not to. I wonder what the true intent of this new general management plan is, when your organization would choose to close a National Park to the public, when there were viable alternative options to keep it open.\

Mr. Director, you may be making these decisions to close public lands to make a political statement, or to appease radical environmentalists who believe that the whole park should be unusable, inaccessible "Wilderness" areas, but the people you are hurting are regular folks.

My district is under assault. We rely on manufacturing, agriculture, mining and tourism. The Obama administration



has proposed new regulations that would prevent children from working on family farms, close the only domestic lead smelter left in the United States and raise . the cost of electricity. Price raises on electricity in particular would put out of business many small manufacturers, and would be devastating to many of my constituents on a fixed income. The only clear objective that the Obama Administration appears to be meeting is shutting down business in rural America, and in particular my district.

Mr. Director, you have a chance to be a part of the solution for my district, not the problem. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is priceless, its value to my district and our area is unparalleled, and the jobs and economic activity that the park facilitates are irreplaceable. Don't allow your department to adopt a General Management Plan that is contrary to the wishes of myself, my constituents, and the other folks who want to be able to access the River.

As we move forward with the process of considering this General Management Plan, I hope you will consider my comments, and also the many other public comments from concerned land and business owners in the district.

Sincerely  
Jason Smith  
Member of Congress

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3083	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,12,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Interior Secretary Jewell:				

Regarding the proposed General Management Plan (GMP) of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR), I have concerns that the National Park Service has not taken into great enough account the input from directly impacted citizens who live, use, and work along the Riverways.

My goal is to provide citizens with a variety of recreational opportunities while continuing to preserve and protect the economic, natural, and cultural resources of the ONSR for future generations. The current proposals under the new GMP do not address my primary concern:

Tourism is one of the most critical components of our rural economy and the ONSR is the primary attraction. Thousands of out-of-state as well as in-state hikers, campers, boaters, hunters, fishermen and horseback riders visit this area annually and bring many irreplaceable dollars when they come. Any further limitations on the access to these assets would severely impact this local economy.

While our legislative delegation agrees we need to protect the ONSR we must not overlook our citizens' heritage and livelihood. We were disappointed that your initial review period had only two open houses for citizens to give their input. Only one of those meetings is located in the region; the other was in St. Louis, which is 150 miles away.

Providing directly impacted citizens with an opportunity to have input on this critical issue is essential for the success and future management of the ONSR. The economic and cultural importance of the ONSR to families and small businesses in Missouri will be threatened if the "NPS Preferred Alternative" is implemented. It appears that the goal of this plan is to shutdown public access points to the rivers, eliminate motorized boat traffic from certain areas, further restrict boat motor horsepower in other areas, close several gravel bars, and propose additional areas to be designated-as federal wilderness. We are adamantly opposed to all of these proposals, as are our constituents and business owners.

We support the "No-Action Alternative" to the current operating system. The ONSR value to the region is unparalleled. Do not adopt a GMP that is contrary to OUI wishes, those of our constituents, and the other folks who depend on access to the Riverways and cannot operate with additional government regulations. In our opinion, the ONSR is already over-managed with burdensome federal regulations. The Riverways support a vibrant and growing tourism industry that is critical to our region and state. We will continue to strongly advocate against further encroachment by the National Park Service limiting our citizens' access to public lands.

As you continue with the process, we hope you will consider our comments and those of the directly impacted

citizens who will be affected by your actions.

Grace & Peace,  
Jeff Pogue  
State Representative

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3084    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Jarvis:

I understand that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (National Park Service) seeks to dramatically curtail the way we enjoy the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers in Missouri. I understand there is a 20 year plan which will place restrictions that will lessen recreational opportunities and cause economic hardships on the communities in and around the two rivers, including:

- â€ Eliminate 65 miles of horse trails adjacent to the rivers
- â€ Eliminate unauthorized river crossings
- â€ Require permits for horseback riding
- â€ Eliminate motor vehicle access to gravel bars

I have been taking my children and horses to Eminence, MO to the Cross Country Trail Ride for 15 years. It's our family vacation. We enjoy trail riding along the rivers, swimming and floating in the rivers and camping along the rivers.

Please do not take away the opportunities for Missourians to enjoy our rivers. It's becoming harder and harder to find places to enjoy our horses in a family setting and the Jack's Fork River in Missouri is our favorite place to combine our passion of horses, riding, family, camping, swimming and floating.

If you 'd like to speak to me by phone, my day time phone is (573) 886-4391 and evenings is (573) 875-5479.

Sincerely,

Melinda Bobbitt

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3085    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,11,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Director Jarvis:

Regarding the proposed General Management Plan (GMP) of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR), we have concerns that the National Park Service has not taken into great enough account the input from directly impacted citizens who live, use, and work along the Riverways.

Our goal is to provide citizens with a variety of recreational opportunities while continuing to preserve and protect the economic, natural, and cultural resources of the ONSR for future generations. The current proposals under the new GMP do not address our primary concern:

Tourism is one of the most critical components of our rural economy and the ONSR is the primary attraction. Thousands of out-of-state as well as in-state hikers, campers, boaters, hunters, fishermen and horseback riders visit this area annually and bring many irreplaceable dollars when they come. Any further limitations on the access to the e assets would severely impact this local economy.

While our legislative delegation agrees we need to protect the ONSR, we must not overlook our citizens' heritage and livelihood. We were disappointed that your initial review period had only two open houses for citizens to give

their input. Only one of those meetings is located in the region; the other was in St. Louis, which is 150 miles away.

Providing directly impacted citizens with an opportunity to have input on this critical issue is essential for the success and future management of the ONSR. The economic and cultural importance of the ONSR to families and small businesses in Missouri will be threatened if the "NPS Preferred Alternative" is implemented. It appears that the goal of this plan is to shutdown public access points to the rivers, eliminate motorized boat traffic from certain areas, further restrict boat motor horsepower in other areas, close several gravel bars, and propose additional areas to be designated as federal wilderness. We are adamantly opposed to all of these proposals, as are our constituents and business owners.

We support the "No-Action Alternative" to the current operating system. The ONSR value to the region is unparalleled. Do not adopt a GMP that is contrary to our wishes, those of our constituents, and the other folks who depend on access to the Riverways and cannot operate with additional government regulations. In our opinion, the ONSR is already over-managed with burdensome federal regulations. The Riverways support a vibrant and growing tourism industry that is critical to our region and state. We will continue to strongly advocate against further encroachment by the National Park Service limiting our citizens' access to public lands.

As you continue with the process, we hope you will consider our comments and those of the directly impacted citizens who will be affected by your actions.

Sincerely,  
Sandy Crawford  
129th District

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3086	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,23,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Interior Secretary Jewell:				

I am writing regarding the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan Draft (ONSr). I am requesting that serious consideration be given to extending the comment period for an additional 90 days to allow for proper response from our citizens and elected officials. Due to the comment period falling during the Christmas season, hunting season, and inclement weather conditions the comment period should be extended to fully accommodate interested parties in our region.

I feel as though this plan could have significant impact on the rights of the public to access and to use the ONSR and its waterways, which has prompted me to ask for further time for review of this expansive document.

These are all legal matters that should be given time for the public to review and to properly comment on. Considering the time it took to create the document draft, it seems that it would be in the best interest of the public to extend the time to review this and follow proper comment procedures as requested by the NPS.

Grace and Peace

State Representative Jeff Pogue  
District 143

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3087	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,16,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Acting Superintendent Runge.				

In light of the historic cold weather, snowfall, and ice impacting Missouri. we ask you to postpone the meetings scheduled this week for public comment on the "Draft General Management Plan" for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Our constituents should have an opportunity to make their voices heard. However, with dangerous 'road conditions and sub-zero temperatures, safety is a real issue,

It is our understanding from discussions with the Omaha office of the National Park Service that it is within your sole discretion to postpone these meetings. Please exercise this discretion, and postpone these meetings until a point in the future at which they can be attended safely.

Sincerely,

Jason Smith  
Roy Blunt  
Clair McCaskill  
Ann Wagner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3088    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Dec,30,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in response to the National Park Service, Ozark National Scenic Riverways Draft General Management Plan.

I do not support the NPS preferred alternative, Alternative B. I feel this restricts locals/year round residents use and ability to access and enjoy the river ways as families have for generations.

Some examples of the unnecessary restrictions include:

" National Park Service wants to restrict an activity primarily partaken by the local resident. They are doing this by restricting motorized use of 34% river year round and an additional 14% during the summer time. That is 48% of the river basically closed to the locals during the peak season. Yet they didn't restrict nonmotorized visitor (tourist) at all, in fact all areas of the river are open year round.

" They want to close "about" 10 miles of roads primarily used by locals and turn them into "hiking trails". I pity the handicapped or the aged local population.

" It closes an untold amount of access to the river. I am sure those accesses are primarily used by local residents.

" They also want to close "approximately" 65 miles of horse trails. The local equestrian population and the economy will suffer as a result of this.

" It eliminates traditional camping. It requires that campers only camp in designated areas. So you wouldn't be able to just pick a gravel bar and set up a tent for the night. Also, all designated campsites have a fee.

I feel the no action alternative is the best course of action.

" It treats all visitors: local, floater, hiker, and equestrian alike. It gives them equal access.

" It doesn't restrict motor boats to nearly 50% of the river during peak times, while it gives floaters 100% access anytime.\

" It doesn't turn traditional local roads to "hiking trails", yet hikers could still hike if they chose to.

" It also doesn't eliminate traditional camping, where you can float, boat, hike, or ride until you find a place to camp for the night.

I feel that the National Park Service has unrealistic ideas that they can create a silent area of the river where there are no unnatural sounds. They must think that visitors aren't going to talk, cough, breath, launch or exit their craft, touch the water with anything, or even move. They, also, must not take into account the highways and county roads in the area and the vehicle sounds that emit from normal travel. I feel that the National Park Service and any visitor, which thinks they can have a completely silent visit, are completely out of their minds.

Thank you,  
Justin D. Tyler

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3089    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Jan,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Secretary Jewell:  
I write to urge you to return the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to the State of Missouri. This issue is of great

importance to me as a senator representing the 33rd Senatorial District and those people whose lives are affected by the riverways. The State of Missouri has the number one Conservation Department in the United States. Superintendent Black and his staff do their best to operate the park with their limited fund and staff. I know the Missouri Department of Conservation and our Missouri Department of Natural Resources, State Parks Division is in a much better position to maintain and operate the area.

I also feel that they are in a better position to consider with the needs of the local people and better understand the economy of one of the poorest areas of our great state.

In 1959, Senate Resolution No. 33 and House Resolution No. 19 recognized the importance of the extraordinary manifestations of nature and recreational attributes of the Current and Eleven Point riverways. Because of this, Missouri requested that Congress enact legislation to preserve the natural resources and provide recreational development and other improvements for the public's use.

After the resolutions were enacted in 1964, the use of the riverways, in accordance with the resolutions, resulted in tourism and trade dollars for this area along with tourism-and recreational -based jobs.

Currently, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is operating under the General Management Plan. The General Management Plan allows opportunities for recreational use, managerial methodology for access, and development designed to successfully achieve the national riverways' purpose. However, the National Park Service is currently proposing a new management plan and urging the adoption of the "Preferred Alternative" management plan. Under the "Preferred Alternative" plan, riverways' access points would be restricted, citizens' abilities to use motorboats would be further restricted, and the Ozark National Scenic Riverways would no longer be using the land for its intended purpose.

Due to the course of action the National Park Service is taking, I urge you to return the lands granted to form the Ozark National Scenic Riverways back to the Missouri Department of Conservation and ultimately the state of Missouri.

Sincerely,  
Mike Cunningham  
State Senator  
District 33

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3090	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				

**Correspondence:** In 1967, my father took me on a canoeing and camping trip to the Upper Current River. I caught my first rainbow trout near Welch Spring at the age of 5. I fell in love with the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) on that trip and have been going back multiple times every year since then (I am now 51 years old).

My love stems from the natural beauty, clear spring-fed streams and the extraordinary user experiences I have enjoyed there, BECAUSE the ONSR is governed by the National Park Service (NPS). No other rivers in our state command such reverence.

As the heated debate over how the ONSR will be managed in the future as set forth by the upcoming General Management Plan (GMP), I am compelled to point out a few things that seem to be lost in all the recent rhetoric.

When the ONSR was established in 1964, the clock began ticking on the Federal management and protection of this natural resource. As quoted in the NPS Criteria for New National Parks guide, "The National Park Service is responsible for managing areas to provide for public enjoyment in such a way that will leave resources 'unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.'"

No one, not even those who support a No Action Plan, can claim this amazing natural treasure is the same today as it was when the ONSR was originally established. No need to go into all of the science, statistics and data ... it's all

there and those at the tip of the arrowhead at ONSR and Regional Management are deeply aware.

Suffice to say, the ONSR has been greatly impaired over the past 50 years. As such, the NPS has violated its own criteria upon which the ONSR was originally established. No direct finger pointing here as this degradation has metastasized like a slow-moving cancer over many years.

Sure things change, and that's precisely why action plans need to be put into place to manage the changing conditions. The 1984 GMP took aim at and essentially hit the target on how the ONSR was to be managed until now. And just as updates were needed in 1984, so too are changes warranted in 2014 ... different time, different streams and 134 miles of formerly pristine riverways that are begging for an intervention. To submit to a No Action Plan for the GMP is pure and utter folly.

As a lifelong supporter and park-goer at ONSR, I am in favor of Alternative B as it provides the most balanced plan for all park visitors.

Lest it be known, I fell (and remain) so much in love with the ONSR that I chose to marry her many years ago ... translation, I am a single, never-been-married, childless man who has set up a "Gift-By-Will" specifically designating the ONSR as the sole beneficiary of my estate.

I am also so passionate about resolving the misunderstandings and deeply rooted resentment for the NPS by local land-rights citizens that I have brought forth a solution to NPS officials from Van Buren to Washington DC ... the solution is in the form of a summer camp to educate school children (especially in local Missouri 8th District schools) about the unique history, culture and ecosystem of the ONSR region.

The camp (originally known as Camp Current River) was validated under former NPS Director, Mary Bomar, but never came to fruition due to budget constraints. The camp was originally designed to be established (very sentimentally) where I caught my first rainbow trout at Welch Lodge on the banks of the Upper Current River.

The purpose and logic of the camp is simple: unless and until future generations understand and appreciate why this area has earned the title of National Scenic Riverways, the resentment will linger and the ONSR superintendent at the post in 2034 will find him/herself fighting these same battles when the next GMP is drafted.

The merit of Camp Current River remains near and dear to my heart; however, I am watching and waiting to see what happens with the GMP and to my ONSR ... and yes, I chose the pronoun "my" on purpose. I own this park along with every tax-paying citizen in the United States. To that end and to uphold the core values of the National Park Service itself, I implore you to support Alternative B in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways General Management Plan.

Best,  
Keith Kohler

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3091	<b>Project:</b>	15793	<b>Document:</b>	56208
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Mr. Black:				

Since the establishment of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSr), citizens from across the state have had the opportunity to experience the rich natural treasures that span the 134 miles in the Ozarks region. Thirty years ago the first General Management Plan (GMP) standards were set to preserve the ONSR for future generations. Today, many believe the National Park Service (NPS) fell short in administering the 1984 GMP.

In 2009, the Missouri Department of Conservation (MDC) wrote the ONSR to express opposition to the preliminary alternatives as either too restrictive or permissive for practical management considerations. A "No Action" GMP alternative was ultimately recommended.

Recently I was informed that MDC's position on the GMP remains the same. In submitted comments, MDC has

committed to work closely with ONSR to administer a GMP that will provide sustainable and practical management for future generations. MDC has suggested developing a working group to maintain a dialogue on protecting and enhancing the interests of the ONSR. Stakeholders throughout the region have also expressed interest in this proposal to my staff repeatedly during the ONSR GMP hearings. The ONSR cannot overlook what MDC can provide as one of our nation's most highly respected state conservation agencies.

I know that ONSR has received input from individuals with many differing opinions on the GMP preferred alternative, many from well-organized networks. Even more community-based groups like the Eminence Chamber of Commerce and Ozark Heritage Project have worked extensively to assist local citizens with less technical capabilities to compile suggestions to share for consideration. I hope you agree that anyone with concerns about the treasures of the ONSR should have a right to submit comments on this important matter.

Like many Missourians, I have reservations about the ONSR GMP preferred alternative B, especially with the significant increase in funding required. I plan to continue to seek guidance from Moe in the near future to discuss various conservation issues and concerns the agency has about the GMP. I look forward to being kept apprised on the progress of the GMP and other plans to enhance the ONSR for future generations.

Sincere regards,  
Senator Roy Blunt

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3092    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Petition  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service,

The Current and Jacks Fork rivers, which make up the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, are Missouri's river jewels. More than 1.3 million people visit each year to hike, float, fish, and swim amid some of Missouri's most stunning natural scenery.

But the Current is threatened by illegal and unauthorized vehicle access, deteriorating water quality and torn-up trails. Last year, the Current was named one of the nation's 10 most endangered rivers.

As the Park Service now updates the General Management Plan for the park, I urge you to adopt a strong, forward-looking plan that will protect the Current for the next 20 years.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3093    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Mar,21,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** E-mail  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Black,

I'm writing to express my vigorous support for a revised management plan for the ONSR that places far stronger restrictions on the use of motorized vehicles and boats, as well as horseback riding. As a dedicated fisherman, canoeist and camper, I regularly make the roughly 2½ hour journey from my home in Springfield to the ONSR to take advantage of the beauty and natural resources of this unique park. There is nothing even remotely similar to it in the Springfield area. Over the years I've increasingly noticed the environmental degradation resulting from ATV use and horseback riding. In fact, one night while camped on a gravel bar on the Current River I was awoken past midnight by the roar of a group of several ATVs! The ONSR is too valuable a resource to Missouri and the nation for this abuse to continue. I know that some members of Congress have suggested that the local community would suffer from the National Park Service's proposed new management plan, but I fish on the Current River roughly fifteen days per year and on each trip I patronize local merchants, including gas stations, restaurants, sporting goods stores and canoe rental companies. Over the years my family and I have probably spent thousands of dollars in Houston, Jadwin, Eminence and other local towns. If the decline of this park continues I will feel obligated to seek out other sites for my outdoor recreation, including the Buffalo River in Arkansas, which seems (from what I can tell) to be more tightly regulated than ONSR. In sum, I feel it would be extremely short-sighted to allow the continued degradation of the ONSR simply to placate a few local businesses who wish to exploit the park for their

own profit regardless of the long-term consequences.

Best,  
Gabriel Ondetti

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3094    **Project:** 15793    **Document:** 56208  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** See Appendix \_\_\_\_ of the Final GMP/EIS for the complete U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service letter regarding Endangered Species Act consultation and compliance.

---