

Correspondence ID: 1Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 10:01:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes as well as others who make hourly wages. Raising fees affects poor people and is regressive.

The Federal Government has spent over a trillion on infrastructure this week. Look into what you can get from that.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Yes as well as others who make hourly wages. Raising fees affects poor people and is regressive.

The Federal Government has spent over a trillion on infrastructure this week. Look into what you can get from that.

Comments: Yes as well as others who make hourly wages. Raising fees affects poor people and is regressive.

The Federal Government has spent over a trillion on infrastructure this week. Look into what you can get from that.

---

Correspondence ID: 2Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 10:01:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Yes as well as others who make hourly wages. Raising fees affects poor people and is regressive.

The Federal Government has spent over a trillion on infrastructure this week. Look into what you can get from that.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Yes as well as others who make hourly wages. Raising fees affects poor people and is regressive.

The Federal Government has spent over a trillion on infrastructure this week. Look into what you can get from that.

Comments: Yes as well as others who make hourly wages. Raising fees affects poor people and is regressive.

The Federal Government has spent over a trillion on infrastructure this week. Look into what you can get from that.

---

Correspondence ID: 3Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 10:20:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not impact my decision to use the park at all. I consider it a duty to pay reasonable use fees for parks, public lands, etc.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Not at all. These use fees are reasonable costs for using resources/facilities that require frequent maintenance, supervision, etc. I

Comments: I am exempt from park entrance fees because of my veteran status and I continue to pay use fees/entrance fees on every NPS unit I visit. These fees are needed to maintain our parks and, as infrequent as most users' visits are, they are actually quite reasonable. If citizens use parks, they should pay reasonable costs for their upkeep. Otherwise, develop grown up backcountry skills and use non-NPS federal lands. If users visit NPS facilities because disabilities limit use of other federal lands with less infrastructure, that seems like the only reasonable exception for cost reduction to me.

---

Correspondence ID: 4Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 10:21:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Not at all. We use an annual pass. Increasing the daily fee will ensure daily park users pay a fair share to support visitor facilities and services.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Not at all. Campground fee of \$35 is very reasonable, and is less than far inferior sites and locations immediately outside the park. The views and hiking access are unparalleled at park campgrounds and at \$35 they are still a complete steal.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 5Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 10:23:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The prices are already too high for the region. Many people end up bivying on side streets in town, neighborhoods and USFS, which creates an acutely high level of forest fire risk. I have visitors on a weekly basis in the summer months who end up in my driveway b/c they can't afford the camping rates.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

While it might slow down the #/people, which could be your intention as other efforts have been targeted at decreasing access/use.

Comments: As a Local resident, park supporter and donor to other park entities, I have been disheartened and disappointed in the current RMNP leadership efforts. While Trail Ridge Road is NPS area, it is also a thoroughfare to the other side of the divide.....RMNP is NOT a museum. No one should be barred from using Trail Ridge as a means of travel, despite the reservation system. Commuter passes??? Please, no one should even have to apply and the wait, potential for declination, is absurd. In regards to winter, the entire park does not need to close if there is a dusting of snow. Just post 4wd required. The reservation system is punitive to local/state residents who support the park, financially, voluntarily and altruistically. For all intent and purposes, we are the grassroots volunteers who watch over the resource, knowing it better than most of the seasonal employees who come and go. Meanwhile, we are treated as if we are trespassing and a public land resource is gated. Speaking of gates.....why is the card swipe gate not on the repair list? It's been nearly 3 years.....wait that's how long the current Supt has been there.....sorry, just really unimpressed. I would actually support an increase if it promoted access, minimized the headache and interaction with Her Bean Counters.....Come up with some better ideas.....then you might get some rally cries. Let the People Roam!

Raising camping fees and daily fees is self serving for the Sup's goals... not the Users'. Ditch the reservation system, increase the # of people in/out..... forget the increase. Again, it is one more thing to support the current Sup's needs.

NO PUBLIC RELEASE OF PERSONAL INFORMATION or STATEMENTS.

---

Correspondence ID: 6Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 10:29:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No effect

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I think you should consider a discount for pass holders and locals as this is a significant increase that would make staying in the park more difficult, leading to increased day traffic - which is already horrible

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 7Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 10:39:24  
Correspondence Type: Web Form  
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
Positive.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
Positive.

Comments: While I support RMNP increase of entrance and campground fees I am very disappointed by RMNP winter road maintenance and also by the complete lack of bike lanes on ALL paved park roads. Also, RMNP is in dire need of a new superintendent who can engage positively the local community and can meet the needs and challenges of a mountain park like RMNP!!!

---

Correspondence ID: 8Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Nov,18 2021 10:59:03  
Correspondence Type: Web Form  
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
Less likely to visit.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
Would not consider an overnight camping trip anymore if implemented.

Comments: I am already paying into the NPS via government taxes. Instead of increasing the fee, let's force government to better manage the flow of money for NPS. Most of it set aside for NPS is being siphoned into non-NPS spending. National Parks should really be free for anyone paying taxes so they can use the service they are already paying in to.

Stop mismanaging the people's money while demanding more!

---

Correspondence ID: 9Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Nov,18 2021 11:02:03  
Correspondence Type: Web Form  
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
It would not.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
It would not.

Comments: I completely support these rate increases. COVID showed us how people were keeping the animals from being able to roam freely. I think there should be a vehicle limit per day as well. Anything to preserve this amazing park.

---

Correspondence ID: 10Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Nov,18 2021 11:05:17  
Correspondence Type: Web Form  
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
We buy weekly or yearly passes. If we bought a daily pass, a \$5 increase is fine.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
Not campers. Sadly.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 11Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 11:10:30  
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I personally think the \$25 was a little high. The reservation fee was a slap in the face, plus completely unreasonable - - how can people plan a trip with visitors when you have to reserve a date and time days or weeks ahead of time? Extremely difficult to coordinate and one of the main reasons I didn't visit the park at all this year. Any increase or continuation of reservations (with or without a fee) will probably mean I don't visit at all next year either.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
Does not apply

Comments: Reservations (at a fee!) plus increased entry fees are a slap in the face to people already frustrated with the government's COVID regulations. You should be ENCOURAGING people to get outside and get some fresh air and enjoying the beauty of Colorado instead of making it just more hassles! Why are you doing this?

Just another reason I spent ALL of my free time this year in states without regulations. Colorado's loss is Wyoming's and South Dakota's gain!

---

Correspondence ID: 12Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 11:13:25  
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

\$5 is only a small increase. I do feel the national parks should be easily available to everyone of all income levels. Tax increases are a better, more equitable way to fund the parks. I would be happy to pay more taxes for the parks!

Comments: Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 13Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 11:15:48  
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No effect at all. We were just there in August, and we would not have minded the extra fee. We love our national parks, and believe they deserve our support.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
Not at all. We travel with a fifth wheel, and we stayed at the Elk Meadows RV Park.

Comments: We have been to 21 national parks. Thank you for all you do to preserve and protect our beautiful parks. They are a national treasure.

---

Correspondence ID: 14Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 11:16:56  
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It wouldn't affect me. \$5 is the price of a Starbucks. I fully support this decision.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
It wouldn't affect me. I am a "local"

Comments: I fully support the raising of the prices in order to support much needed maintenance. In order to continue the support, I'd recommend that NPS advertise what projects that this increase has paid for.

---

Correspondence ID: 15Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 11:18:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

As with many folks, the continued rising cost of daily entrance fees would discourage me from visiting as frequently.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

The camping fee increase would not directly affect me, this is something I am happy to pay for.

Comments: My primary concerns about fee increase it's it's reduction in equity and access for many local Coloradans. There are many low-income families, especially children, all across the front range that should have equal access to our parks. I understand the importance of collecting these fees. But to increase the main barrier to our National Parks and reduce access to some of the folks who need it the most is not an acceptable answer. America's National Parks should be for ALL, not just those that can afford it.

---

Correspondence ID: 16Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 11:18:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I will visit less. Which I assume is what the park wants after implementing the reservation system in the first place. You need more funds? GET RID OF THAT GARBAGE. Even your internal poll shows at least half the staff doesn't like it. The town of Estes Park and its residents pay taxes every year to provide the infrastructure that feeds directly into RMNP. The unilateral decision making that goes on, that directly affects residents has gotten to an absurd level. Less visitors = less money. For our parks and our town. There have been at least 3 fee increases in the last 10 years that I can remember. If you need a bigger money grab start lobbying to congress or increasing your own donation outreach programs. Quit looking for the people who already pay expensive fee's to subsidize your park. You'd have 10x the traffic if you got rid of the reservation system and put in a few more automated pass lanes.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Less likely to visit and stay anywhere in the national park.

Comments: Increase automated pass lanes and get rid of the reservation system. The only automated gate you have is always conveniently "broken". I can't tell you how many times as a resident I show up at 5:30PM and the entire staff that manages the gates are gone at either entrance. Hard to collect a fee when you aren't there in the first place!

---

Correspondence ID: 17Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 11:19:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not. I support our public lands and see the need to increase entrance and camping fee. As much as I love seeing our lands used, a fee increase would potentially reduce visitors to give the land a chance to recover from overuse. If you have to raise entrance and camping fees, you have to.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Again, it would not. I don't get up there to camp as much as I would like to anyway so an extra \$5 for a few nights a year is nothing. I would spend that extra 10 or 15 bucks on a pizza that same weekend.

Comments: Nobody likes to see fees increase, but the demand and usage for our public lands is at unsustainable levels. With USFS, USFWS, NPS, BLM, et al at severely underfunded levels, agencies are forced to find other revenue streams to continue to provide the services and access we expect from land managers. We must all do our part to preserve these areas for generations, even if that means paying a little more to get in.

---

Correspondence ID: 18Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 11:23:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I think it would improve it because park infrastructure would be better and the higher price would slightly reduce number of visitors.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It would not affect me at all since I never use them and don't plan to.

Comments: I really like the new vehicle reservation system. I also think people who ride a bus in from Estes Park shouldn't have to pay.

---

Correspondence ID: 19Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 11:26:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

This would not affect me as I'm a pass holder but I fail to see how this feels would generate much revenue mor which group you are targeting. This seems exorbitant for a day pass when a weekly pass is \$35. Our local families would be hard pressed to pay \$30 for a daily pass. I feel adding that amount to the weekly pass is more appropriate...or both.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I'd gladly pay the increase and do would anyone who wants to camp in the park. It actually cost more to camp in surrounding areas of RMNP. Camping could be increased by \$10 and be competitive.

Comments: Do we need to increase fees at the major parks...yes. But I feel you're looking at increasing the wrong demographic...those that use the park for the longest time should pay the most. If you're increasing entrance fees...do it across the board.

My family used the park system extensively all year round. We appreciate all you do!

---

Correspondence ID: 20Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 11:34:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I would be unaffected and am happy to support our national parks.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I would be unaffected and am happy to support our national parks.

Comments: I would hope that the increase in fees can be used to help increase the presence of park rangers in some of the most popular areas of the park. It upsets me to see visitors trampling all over the delicate tundra and disturbing the wildlife.

---

Correspondence ID: 21Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 11:34:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Not at all

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Not at all

Comments: I support the proposed fee increases at RMNP. It is a such beautiful treasure and so deserving of funds to maintain its integrity.

---

Correspondence ID: 22Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 11:45:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

We would still visit RMNP & do, in fact, plan on visiting again next summer. No one WANTS to pay more for anything, but if a \$5 increase is necessary to make improvements to the park then we fully support it.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

We do not camp so this would not affect us.

Comments: We love RMNP & would do or pay pretty much anything to see it maintained for generations to come. Thank you to everyone who takes such good care of it & all of our national parks!

---

Correspondence ID: 23Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 12:01:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not affect my visit either way

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It would not affect my camping frequency.

Comments: As someone who grew up in Grand Lake with the park being about a quarter mile away, RMNP holds a very special place in my heart. I spent a lot of time there with my family. I fully support the fee increases and think it's the least we can do.

---

Correspondence ID: 24Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 12:10:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

This increase would not negatively impact my visits to the park. Conversely, it might even increase my visits if it helps improve the experience.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

N/A for me, as I do not camp.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 25Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 12:22:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Minimal financial impact that would not be detrimental.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

No impact.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 26Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 12:24:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It will not. We have a life-time pass. However, we do contribute in other ways. We have come to Rocky since 1973, sometimes yearly, sometimes missing a few years. We usually come for 2 to 3 weeks and may go into the park more than once a day. An increase in fees in that situation would hurt. I assume that weekly passes would be available for people. Raising the fees for one time visitors or those passing through should not hurt. We are thankful for our Golden Eagle Pass.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

We do not camp, but don't see how fee increases would hurt as long as the campgrounds are maintained.

Comments: My concern is for those who vacation in Estes and go into the park often, like us. If one doesn't have a Golden Eagle pass, will there be reasonable weekly passes?

Correspondence ID: 27Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 12:43:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I am totally in favor of the increase; I would still come to the park.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It would not impact me - we come for the day only.

Comments: I favor an increase in fees to help maintain the park, even though I recognize the increase may adversely impact individuals and families that are lower income. I would favor some sort of discount - but admit I have no idea how that might work.

I also favor year round reservations to enter - increased fees along with some added control on crowding will help preserve the park.

Again I admit this creates hardship for probably many people. I don't know what a balanced approach looks like but would certainly favor one!

Correspondence ID: 28Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 12:56:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I think this would be very positive- a 5 dollar (or even 10 dollar) increase could have a huge positive impact on the park. In addition- the slight added cost may further support carpooling or taking the shuttle from downtown Estes. Would strongly support.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Would strongly support. We have to invest to maintain our natural resources.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 29Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 13:20:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Combined with the reservation system (which really stinks by the way...almost impossible to get a pass into the Bear Lake corridor), this gives me pause



Comments: Topic Question 2:

Probably wouldn't affect us.

Comments: If you're going to raise the daily fees, then completely dump the reservation system. This park is owned by the people and you guys have done a marvelous job keeping people out, rather than letting them into THEIR property.

---

Correspondence ID: 30Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 13:27:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

This would not affect me at all since we only come once a year and spend at least a week.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

We don't camp, so this would not affect me.

Comments: I think your fee policy is absolutely ridiculous. It only costs 5 dollars more to stay for seven days than for just one day? That makes no sense at all. Keep your daily fee low so that local people and people in lower income brackets can come for a day to enjoy the park. I would propose a daily pass for \$25.00. Then have an intermediate pass for 3 days for \$50.00. A weekly pass would be \$75.00. People that come for a week are already spending lots of money, so a \$75.00 fee is still a bargain and not a hardship at all.

---

Correspondence ID: 31Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 13:29:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Studies have shown that people who have limited income (poor) already do not utilize national parks at the same rate as those who have more family / personal funds. Increasing any fees for those wanting to access what the U.S. has to offer is unacceptable. I would also advocate for a sliding scale or cheaper fees during the week, as many people working minimum wage jobs have to work on weekends. Additional fees are exclusionary and discriminatory.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Studies have shown that people who have limited income (poor) already do not utilize national parks at the same rate as those who have more family / personal funds. Increasing any fees for those wanting to access what the U.S. has to offer is unacceptable. I would also advocate for a sliding scale or cheaper fees during the week, as many people working minimum wage jobs have to work on weekends. Additional fees are exclusionary and discriminatory.

Additionally, I think raising the campground fees may increase your difficulties in keeping campers in designated campsites...more dispersed camping should be available.

Comments: This makes me so incredibly angry, as I see it as a blatant disregard for those who already cannot afford to access the national parks. National parks have changed my life and my perspective on the environment - barring someone from entrance by raising an already high price of admission is ridiculous. Do you all believe a family on food stamps would be able to afford the entry fee for RMNP? Why are they less deserving to hike or enjoy the mountains?

---

Correspondence ID: 32Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 13:36:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Would help to improve the experience.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

No effect. I do not camp

Comments: Feds not going to send more money so raise the entrance fees. People already line up to get in. Fees will help improve trails etc.

---

Correspondence ID: 33Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Nov,18 2021 13:36:17  
Correspondence Type: Web Form  
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
Would help to improve the experience.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
No effect. I do not camp

Comments: Feds not going to send more money so raise the entrance fees. People already line up to get in. Fees will help improve trails etc.

---

Correspondence ID: 34Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Nov,18 2021 13:38:09  
Correspondence Type: Web Form  
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
It wouldn't.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
It wouldn't.

Comments: In soliciting this feedback, you will almost definitely receive a lot of comments about the unfairness of a rate increase- -that increasing costs is moving us further and further away from being "open and available to ANYONE." And it's true- -wouldn't it be great if all public spaces could be 100% free? Of course it would. But... It's more important to me that the place is preserved and cared for than everyone be able to get in. There are beautiful places all over our country that are lower-cost or completely free. I would rather see RMNP cared for, even if that means an increase in prices.

So, as long as you can promise to us that the rate increases will be put toward the betterment of the park, its employees, and the goal of keeping the park clean, beautiful, and preserved for generations to come... Then by all means, increase that price to whatever it needs to be increased to.

In summary: The long-term preservation of RMNP is way more important than my \$5. I won't miss it. Thanks for all you do.

(b) (6)

---

Correspondence ID: 35Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Nov,18 2021 13:50:02  
Correspondence Type: Web Form  
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
Not at all. We would happily pay \$5 more during each of our ~7-10 visits to the park per year.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
We generally do not use the front-country campgrounds so I cannot comment on this.

Comments: I support raising the fees in order to help preserve and maintain the park.

---

Correspondence ID: 36Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 13:56:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I'd still come up as often as possible. No effect.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

That does not apply to me. Don't use the campgrounds.

Comments: Raise them both. With inflation..it'll be harder and harder to maintain the level of staff etc. If people buy a yearly pass..it's so worth it. I pay \$90 just for a Larimer county pass...and those parks aren't that great. I also buy the state park pass and those parks are crowded too. People will pay to play.

---

Correspondence ID: 37Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 14:47:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It will not

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It will not

Comments: The park is overcrowded and increasing the fees should help keep it a great place to visit. If anything, I would increase the entrance fee by more than \$5.

---

Correspondence ID: 38Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 14:52:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I support increasing the daily entrance pass. I usually have an annual pass (and honestly, that price should be raised to \$100 imo) but I think the park needs the revenue.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I would still come to visit the park with an increase, but I would be able to spend less nights. That is a shame as I normally spend at least one week per summer at the park and although an additional \$5 doesn't seem like much, it would add up quickly.

Comments: Quite honestly, \$35 per night is pretty high for the campgrounds in the park. Sites are small without hookups. Comparing them to other campgrounds in Estes Park doesn't make sense since many of those have hookups. It would make more sense to increase rates on larger sites (RVs over 20' for example) or more private/desirable sites. That type of rate increase would affect me personally, as I come with a larger RV, but I feel like \$30 or \$35 for a tent site is high. \$35 is higher than state park reservations and the majority of those campgrounds have hookups or shower houses with hot water. I doubt \$35 would make people not come, and maybe reducing crowds is part of the reason to raise the rate, but it makes it less attractive.

For winter camping: \$35 for no services seems ridiculously high. I camped there last year and the weekend I spent would have cost \$105 for no hookups and having to shovel out my own site to prepare for camping. Another idea might be to increase the cost of the sites to \$35 but then offer a discount for annual pass holders to \$30 in the summer or \$25 in the winter.

---

Correspondence ID: 39Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 14:57:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form  
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
No The extra money will help with improvements in the park.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
No

Comments: I would like to see the park go back to limiting the number of vehicles and people entering the park for the day. Too many people ruins the park, puts a definite strain on the wildlife and nobody can enjoy the park when it is over run with humans. I think all national parks should have a reservation policy to limit the amount of damage over population in the park causes. When the park is destroyed it's too late then.

---

Correspondence ID: 40Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Nov,18 2021 15:07:00  
Correspondence Type: Web Form  
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
It would not affect my visit to the park. In fact, it would improve my visit if it were less crowded.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
This also would not affect my visit to the park.

Comments: I think if the park needs to raise more revenue to make improvements, then charging more per vehicle is a great way to do that. Personally, I love the park and have been visiting it for 30 years. The crowds are enormous these days and so that's a great opportunity to raise more money to expand services.

---

Correspondence ID: 41Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Nov,18 2021 15:35:08  
Correspondence Type: Web Form  
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
I buy an annual pass, so there would be no change

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
There would be no impact. I absolutely support an increase in camping fees to better support campground management

Comments: RMNP has been a place I visit frequently since I was a child and I absolutely support any fee increases used to better serve the wildlife, plants, and visitors to the park. I am glad to learn that 80% of these fees will continue to stay at RMNP.

---

Correspondence ID: 42Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Nov,18 2021 15:47:34  
Correspondence Type: Web Form  
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
It is already too hard to get into the park. The price of everything has gone up and this will remove the option to enjoy this beautiful park for those with less income.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
I don't camp there and this would ensure that never do.

Comments: I love this park. It's close to home and was something we did regularly before Covid. Now I have to plan a month in advance to even be able to enter the park. I wasn't able to go at all in 2021. Please don't make the park even less accessible. Or prioritize those that live here, lower cost, don't raise it. Offer more opportunities to volunteer to offset.

---

Correspondence ID: 43Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 16:07:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

As an annual pass holder, I would not be affected by an increase in fees. Even if I was paying the daily fee, \$5 is insignificant compared to the benefits I gain from visiting the park.

I would appreciate, however, an entrance lane for those who already have a pass. Those lines get pretty long.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I camped for 7 nights this year in Glacier Basin. I will camp in RMNP in future years regardless of price increases; I expect these increases as part of inflation and increased park operating costs with higher visitor loads. Without the price increases, the park cannot be expected to adequately maintain roads and facilities. The bathrooms at Glacier Basin definitely showed the lack of staff during the pandemic this year and the more popular trails showed much more wear than I recalled from my last visit in 2019. I'd love to support the park's ability to continue to preserve the landscape for generations to come.

Comments: I'm a huge fan of the park service and especially RMNP. We live in Indiana and drive to the Rockies every other year so that our children can experience the park. Thank you for all that you do maintain and preserve this beautiful space.

---

Correspondence ID: 44Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 16:17:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

If you are talking about charging more for the timed entry fee charged in the warmer months it would cause me to change my vacation plans and not come to Rocky Mountain National Park as often. If you are talking about the daily entrance fee I would have see how much the annual fee is increased, as that is what I usually buy. I would be able to handle that better if it didn't go up to much, say \$10.

Comments: Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 45Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 16:19:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not. I usually purchase a season pass but I would not mind spending more money to help the parks maintain. Plus hopefully an increase will help with the crowds! :)

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It would not. I only back country camp in RMNP.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 46Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 16:38:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I'm opposed to an increase in entrance, and camping fees.

I feel the park sets records in attendance each year, and collect reservation fees.

I understand upkeep, but families who have limited income will again be pushed out in experiencing

The beauty of RMNP.

It's going to turn our national parks into a place where only the wealthy can visit.

Dividing the United State even more.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Camping is getting to be like skiing.

Only the wealthy will be camping in the future.

Low income families will never know what a night camping in RMNP will be like.

SAD.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 47Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 16:58:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I hope it would reduce the number of visitors. People are moving to Colorado in droves; all of them wanting to love our mountains to death. Maybe a fee increase will lower the number of visitors. Then maybe I would consider visiting more often.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It would not affect me. Camping is a terrible waste of time.

Comments: I support any fee increase. Make the people who use the resources pay for them.

---

Correspondence ID: 48Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 17:00:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Actually, increased entrance fee might mean we would visit more often if the result was to reduce traffic. As a former national park ranger, I think an increase in fees is long overdue. The impact of visitors on ROMO is going in the wrong direction unfortunately.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Since I camp i the backcountry, a front country increase would not effect me. I'd support a \$5 back country increase too.

Comments: As a former ROMO volunteer who hikes, snowshoes and camps in the park throughout the year, I treasure this park and have since 1973. You all need to be more aggressive in protecting and preserving the landscape for future generations. That means boosting fees where needed and hiring more park rangers, both law enforcement and interns. Thanks!

---

Correspondence ID: 49Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 17:03:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I will go elsewhere

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I will not be affected. I don't camp

Comments: Why are access prices going up when so many groups get free access. I'm tired of prices going up for some while others get free access.

---

Correspondence ID: 50Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 17:11:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It wouldnt...we have the lifetime senior pass

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I assume with our pass we still get half/off pricing?

Comments: So disappointed that Timber Creek CG has been closed for two summers. Please reopen and keep it no reservation.

---

Correspondence ID: 51Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 18:02:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No effect

Comments: Topic Question 2:

No effect

Comments: I support an increase in Daily Vehicle Entrance fees.

---

Correspondence ID: 52Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 18:10:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It's already expensive. You also need to stop the timed entry and the \$2 extra fee.it is such a hassle to get a decent time to get into park for locals. Usually come to park twice a month. Only got good reservation time 3 times this summer. Rmnp is pricing out poor people.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Again, pricing poor people out of the rare camping trip.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 53Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 18:28:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not - the current and proposed fees are a bargain!

Comments: Comments: I think the parks are completely under-funded. These seem like very modest price increases that should be implemented.

---

Correspondence ID: 54Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 18:45:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do support this change. Park foot traffic was increased tremendously over the past couple years and these extra funds can be used to serve the public better

---

Correspondence ID: 55Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 18:45:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I will continue to visit the park with the same frequency even with increased entrance fees.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I will continue to camp in the park even if the campground fees are increased.

Comments: I strongly support the fee increase.

---

Correspondence ID: 56Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 19:22:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The fee increase would encourage car pooling that should result in less congestion on roads and parking areas. The fee increase should provide additional funding to the park for maintenance and improvements to park facilities resulting in an improved visitor experience.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

The price increase would not deter me from camping and would still remain a price that is way below area private campgrounds.

Comments: I fully support the proposed fee increases.

---

Correspondence ID: 57Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 19:41:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It wouldn't

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It wouldn't

Comments: Inflation is increasing dramatically because our federal government leaders are Ignorant Morons and you want to raise rates. Typical government answer to everything. Raise rates, raise taxes. The more you tax the less you get. If you want less raise the rates.

---

Correspondence ID: 58Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 19:52:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I fully support the increase in fees for the necessary improvements.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I fully support the increase in fees for the necessary improvements.

Comments: RMNP has been 'loved' too much and there must be some significant changes in park management and budget. The federal government and Congress will not do what is necessary within a timely manner so increasing the fees is required, I fully support the increase in fees.

---

Correspondence ID: 59Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 19:58:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form



Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I feel the proposed increase fee is minimal and a necessary proposal with the cost and wages, etc. of everything else these days. And, where can you go to get such a MILLION DOLLAR vacation for the dollar? Great job, Colorado!

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I am not a camper so any increase there would not affect me personally. But once again to maintain the high quality we all receive from Colorado it would seem to be the right proposal to make.

Comments: We have not been able to visit your State for 2 yrs., however, next year will be a better effort. Did I understand that the "Golden Pass" is no longer to be used for Park Entrance nationwide?

---

Correspondence ID: 60Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 20:12:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I don't think it would impact it at all for myself if the majority of park users. It is within the lines of inflation and labor shortages that require the fees to keep pace. It is a responsible increase to maintain park services (trash service, road repair, employee retention).

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It would not impact my use of the campground. Relative to local lodging rates this modest increase in fee is something the vast majority of users can pay. If there is a way to maintain a constant fee for a group site who is more often allowing access to NGOs who often subsidize cost for groups out of their pocket. Alternately maybe a way to keep an option for fee maximums for certain charity groups?

Comments: Thank you for considering a fee structure that is sustainable for our park system to exist for future generations. Inflation has impacted the costs of many goods and services and is something to consider for some of our most beautiful places in our country. I say this not a resident of a mountain town with access to a national park but from someone who truly believes that the park system must remain sustainable for our future.

---

Correspondence ID: 61Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 20:51:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not. What affects my visitation to the park is the large crowds. With the current demand for usage and the resultant negative impact on wildlife and flora, requiring closing sections for recovery, why wouldn't you raise fees by \$10, \$15 even doubling fees is a bargain.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Does not affect me. However, you need to double fees to adequately manage and protect this valuable resource to ensure future generations can enjoy RMNP.

Comments: Current reservation system locks out many locals unless we're willing to get up early and arrive before 8am. Adequately raising fees for all guests will provide the resources to manage and protect RMNP. Most out of state visitors will continue to visit RMNP. A \$50 daily visitation fee will not keep them away.

---

Correspondence ID: 62Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 21:29:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not. I visit as often as I can, and will continue to do so.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It would not. I visit as often as I can, and will continue to do so.

Comments: I support the fees increases with one significant caveat: When I pay the same price for the same thing, the only difference being the time when goods and services are rendered, I expect to receive the same product.

But surely the RMNP cannot guarantee that I receive the same product when it proposes to charge me the same price for camping in Moraine in the winter as it does for camping at other times of the year.

Certainly some of the inequalities are beyond its control: Trail Ridge Road will be closed due to weather, of course... but regardless of the reason, the park still becomes much smaller and less accessible...despite being charged the same price.

And Ranger Programs to enhance my education ?

And Ranger presence to keep my safety on par with summer campers?

And water?

I doubt you can economically achieve parity in your summer offering versus your winter product, and therefore, I would not expect to pay the same price.

Thanks for your consideration.

(b) (6)

---

Correspondence ID: 63Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 22:11:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I will always support any increase in fees for visiting the park.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

This increase would not affect my visits to the park.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 64Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,18 2021 22:15:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The daily increase would have no effect on my visit as when we come from Wisconsin we're coming for more than a day at a time. For us it's the weekly pass, and for \$35 for a week, that's still a steal. I would propose increasing the weekly fee by \$5 in addition to the daily pass.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

The camping fee increase is a different story. \$35/night for the services provided is pricey. Essentially the campgrounds offer water, flush toilet bathrooms and a dump station in addition to the campsite. The bathrooms are extremely dated and in need of service in most areas. A person essentially pays for the view, which has already been done by the entrance pass. To compare to a campground outside the park is not a fair comparison because those parks offer hookups, which to many people are essential.

If the campgrounds were state of the art and beautiful facilities, one could make the case for a \$5 increase to \$35/night. But

they're not.

Comments: We love RMNP so regardless of the fee increases, I'm sure we will be out to visit again soon. But these camping fees are a little out of hand for the services provided. The entrance fees could be raised even higher, especially the weekly pass. Many people won't think twice about spending WAY more than \$35 a person at an amusement park, but for \$35 for a carload for 7 days? That's the best thing going in the country!

---

Correspondence ID: 65Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,19 2021 02:31:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would reduce my inclination to visit the public lands and increase my skepticism of park management.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It would decrease my overall visitation.

Comments: A raise in fees in any way is antithetical to the idea of public lands. As soon as you raise fees, you are automatically excluding a part of the population from participating in and spending time in the lands that supposedly belong to them.

---

Correspondence ID: 66Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,19 2021 05:46:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It would not.

Comments: National Parks are meant to be a place where all Americans can experience the wonders of the continent, regardless of your means. Costs must be kept low. I appreciate the programs the funds support, but justifying the price increase by saying they are in line with other services outside the park neglects the obligation the national park service has to provide access to ALL AMERICANS.

---

Correspondence ID: 67Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,19 2021 06:09:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not impact my decision to visit the park at all. I feel like the entrance fee increases necessary to maintain the park.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I also feel the increase for the campground fees is also necessary. It is a small increase and should not impact my decision to camp in the park at all

Comments: You all do amazing work and I hope that this passes so that we can all continue to enjoy the park and all it's beauty! This is such a minor increase and necessary given the changing climate and the additional workload that puts on your staff.

---

Correspondence ID: 68Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,19 2021 06:23:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Puts it further out of reach, and I am not going to visit anymore. I used to purchase an annual every year the last time I lived in CO. Even they are out of reach now for me currently

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I wouldn't visit

Comments: This is a bad move for the NPS. It further puts it out of reach for many Americans. Soon only a small minority will be able to afford to visit something that as a citizen we have already paid and continue to pay for. Need more funding? Get it from the Feds, not the public. I certainly will not visit anymore. As a matter of fact I only went once this year, and was appalled that it's \$25 for one single day. And this is coming from a former enforcement ranger at Isle Royale NP.

---

Correspondence ID: 69Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,19 2021 06:49:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not affect me as I have an America the Beautiful annual pass.

Comments: Comments: Why does Rocky Mountain NP even have a one-day pass? Why not eliminate the daily pass and have visitors buy a 7-day pass instead? That should provide more revenue than raising the price and simplify the administration of the pass program by having one less option.

---

Correspondence ID: 70Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,19 2021 07:55:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I will visit just as often

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I will visit just as often, though I prefer back country camping

Comments: These are fair price increases for important work needed to preserve and improve the park.

Though there should be ways for people with lesser means to have access through outreach programs.

---

Correspondence ID: 71Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,19 2021 08:24:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I have a lifetime pass and so it would not affect me.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I probably would not camp at RMNP. I think families could have a difficult time paying that amount.

Comments: Other national parks that charge \$35 for a campsite (Yellowstone's Canyon Campground, for example) also have showers, laundromats and a separate indoor area to wash dishes in their front country campgrounds. RMNP has none of these things so why would I pay the same amount?

I camped in RMNP's Moraine Park Campground in early October of 2021 and it was horrible. The campground dumpsters were so packed with garbage I couldn't even get a paper towel in there if I wanted to and I am not exaggerating. I have never seen anything like it. The saddest thing was the apathy from the staff when I told them about it. There were no hand towels in the restrooms nor a single garbage can in there. Dirty dishes must be washed outside in a single sink.

Now I am no expert on bears but I am guessing that packed dumpsters and food from dirty dishes in an outdoor sink doesn't exactly keep bears away which the park is so concerned about and with good reason. Might I add that the campers kept their sites clean.

The pit toilets were filthy and smelly in the campground. RMNP can only keep 40% of their campgrounds open due to lack of staff!

Now given all of that, why would I ever pay more to camp there? If anything they should charge less than they do now.

---

Correspondence ID: 72Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,19 2021 08:52:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Increasing daily park fees creates an obstacle for families and visitors who may not be as well off. The fees are already pretty expensive to access the park.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

These increased fees for camping will restrict recreation opportunities for disadvantaged families.

Comments: Eliminate the reservation system so local people can access our national park when we want to. I haven't visited the park since the reservation system has made it incredibly inconvenient to access.

---

Correspondence ID: 73Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,19 2021 08:52:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No effect

Comments: Topic Question 2:

No effect

Comments: I am for the increase as there is so much infrastructure work that needs attention.

The extra \$ can only help

---

Correspondence ID: 74Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,19 2021 08:58:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I'm all for a price increase though, I admit, I purchase an annual National Park Pass every year. So, a daily price increase would not effect my visits to the park.

While I realize a price increase may effect some people, I don't believe a \$5.00 increase is enough to prohibit people from visiting the park. In addition, I'm an advocate for increasing the annual National Park Pass to \$100.00 to help the park(s).

P.S. I'm a Rocky Mountain National Park Conservancy Member and I contribute to National Park Foundation.

Question: Do you receive any funds from National Park Foundation to help with such projects?

I'd really like to know if contributing to this organization is a good use of my donations. Thank you.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

United States

N/A

Comments: I'd like to see part of the \$5.00 increase go to improve Rocky's toilet systems. A good example is the toilets in Denali have the sweet smelling toilet (SST) system, which helps using the bathrooms/pits tolerable. The toilets in Rocky are terrible and I would welcome the SST system, even with an additional price increase.

Thank you.

---

Correspondence ID: 75Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,19 2021 09:11:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

As a CO resident we would visit the park many times a year. This increase would make me think twice about coming for a day trip.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I would consider the amenities offered in relation to other campgrounds outside of the park before booking. Given the federal assistance I would feel that the park should be in a position to offer cheaper camping options or better services or increased number of sites.

Comments: Unless there has been a sudden and significant rise in the cost to maintain the park, the proposed amount of increase for fees is another unnecessary hit on the pocket of American families. Especially the large increases for camping. Federal assistance should be exploited before the public. If the fees are implemented perhaps offering a daily discount to CO residents separate from the annual pass.

---

Correspondence ID: 76Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,19 2021 10:40:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would cause me to re-think going to the park. I also know a lot of people who struggle with the current expense of attending this National Park that is supposed to be for citizens to be able to use.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I would think twice before making a reservation.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 77Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,19 2021 10:40:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not diminish our interest in visiting the park.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

The proposed fees are very reasonable. They're still a small fraction of what a hotel or motel would cost.

Comments: We're used to paying far higher admissions for other forms of entertainment - professional sports games, restaurant dining, movies, theme parks, etc. We know a LOT more revenue is needed for appropriate maintenance in our amazing National Parks. We regret the Congress has failed to provide the needed funds and funding must come from somewhere. Of course no one wants to pay more, but let's be responsible and support this rare natural resource.

---

Correspondence ID: 78Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,19 2021 10:50:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

This would restrict many families on limited income to access this beautiful national park, especially for Coloradans. In Colorado we love going to our national parks for the day, hiking, bird watching, climbing, picnicking. Please don't limit our access by increasing the price.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

This would also restrict families access to a historically inexpensive way to introduce our children to the great outdoors. Please don't limit our camping by increasing the price.

Comments: If National Parks continue to raise prices, it takes the parks away from all Americans, and gives it to only the Americans at a higher economic level. Don't turn National Parks into "resorts" with resort prices.

---

Correspondence ID: 79Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,19 2021 11:40:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I won't purchase the daily vehicle entrance fee pass.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I won't camp there and I never have. The state of Colorado is way too greedy and they try to charge for gods land. It is everybody's land and they try to get more and more money from people from the natural outdoor spaces.

Comments: What are all of our tax dollars being used for? I'm upset that the natural outdoor recreational spaces are costing more and more to use. God would want everyone to be healthy and get outside and enjoy the natural beauty for no cost.

---

Correspondence ID: 80Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,19 2021 11:51:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not, however the park should consider a shuttle only service like Zion.

This would reduce congestion, exhaust pollution, crowding the streets during an animal sighting, and provide tourists with fear of heights the opportunity to see Trail Ridge Road.

In the meantime, perhaps the increase could go towards additional entrance lanes to reduce crowding at the gates.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

N/A to me

Comments: The park is doing a great job managing the crowds. I would like to thank the Rangers for their work. One idea might be to place electronic road signs at the gates educating visitors on how to respect wildlife, drive mountain roads and other pertinent information.

---

Correspondence ID: 81Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,19 2021 13:05:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I would not be significantly impacted. I think a higher fee would potentially improve my visit, if the funds were allocated toward restoration, ranger enforcement, and leave no trace education.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Again, if the funds are used to protect the park's natural resources and ensure guests are educated, I would think this price change would make my experience better while camping at the park.

Comments: I support the Park's fee increase so long as the vast majority of the revenue (90% or more) goes directly to improving the park experience by educating visitors, restoring and protecting resources, conducting research, and enforcing rules and regulations.

---

Correspondence ID: 82Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,19 2021 13:28:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I am an annual pass user and use the campgrounds. I would gladly pay for the increased fees for mitigation and recreation safe purposes. Please consider those in your decision perhaps with a new program for our population with limited access and opportunity. I would gladly pay fees for these programs as well.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

No effect for our family, but make sure to offer the access and opportunity for those with limited access and opportunity. Perhaps funded by Friends of RMNP organization.

Comments: Thank you for this consideration. I believe it is necessary and balanced on the recommendation. Continue to pursue programs of access and opportunity for those in our community and region and utilize those NPO/NGO options to fund this so we can continue the grand traditions and expand new ones within this National Park.

---

Correspondence ID: 83Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,19 2021 13:51:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The proposed increase in Vehicle Entrance fee will likely not affect my visits because, as I understand it, the proposed increase does not apply to valid and existing interagency passes.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

The proposed increase in overnight camping fee will impact my ability and willingness to enjoy camping in the park.

Comments: I am opposed to the proposed fee increases. The National Park Service was established to preserve our beautiful landscapes and for the enjoyment of future generations. Increasing entrance & camping fees will tend to discourage the general public from enjoying such beautiful legacy.

---

Correspondence ID: 84Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,19 2021 17:26:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I would continue to purchase an Annual Pass.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I would expect improved services in the form of cleaner facilities and increased numbers of campsites.

Comments: Increase the fees.

I was not aware that daily entry fees were so low. Yosemite is \$35. Yellowstone is \$35. This is an easy decision.

---

Correspondence ID: 85Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,19 2021 18:21:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I am concerned that it would affect low to moderate income families ability to access the park. It will become luxury that



many families will not be able to afford. Just as the HOV lanes on interstate 70 are now open to anyone if you pay the extra cost, people who can afford higher cost get access that others are denied. The park system tried to raise the daily fee a few years ago and it was opposed at that time as well. That is a 20% increase over the past year. \$30 for an individual to access the park is ridiculous. People already pay taxes to access these gems and you should find other ways to deal with deferred maintenance. Congress should find other ways to deal with deferred maintenance. If we can pass an infrastructure bill, some of those funds should be able to go to DOI and USDA for forest and park protection and upgrades. You are pricing out the people who most need to access the forest.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I do not support the increase in Campground overnight fees especially when the Rocky Mountain national Park Timber Creek Campground has not been open for two years. I recently moved from grand Beach to Gunnison, but was there for the past five years and so I am familiar with the west entrance and the lack of services there. There has definitely been a cost savings there and you should defer any increase in fees when many park facilities have not been open through Covid and even in 2021. The past two years have caused a lot of people hardship and you should delay any fee increases.

Comments: This is not the time to raise any fees. People have had a very difficult time through 2020 and 2021 due to Covid and loss of income. You should defer increasing entrance fees and campground fees. We have also had a savings at many of those properties because they have simply not been open.

---

Correspondence ID: 86Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,19 2021 18:25:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

We will stop visiting. We come twice to four times a year. We patronize Estes ALL the time. You've continually proven you can't manage money, why would we give you any more? Truly we won't come.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

See answer number 1.

Comments: Get rid of the online system, it's worthless. Go back to Teddy Roosevelt and make it easy to visit.

---

Correspondence ID: 87Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,19 2021 20:09:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I would not be affected by this increase due to the fact of my lifetime pass.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

We are on a fixed income and an increase of the fees in the range that you are proposing is the equivalent of a campground with electric and water hookups which is not available in RMNP. I don't have a problem with a small increase but I feel this is outrageous. Especially the winter increase for nothing.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 88Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,19 2021 20:23:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

My visitation would not be affected as I but the Annual Pass normally.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Camping is already far to expensive unless the rates being quoted are for a fully connected site an RV would use. If not already tired it would be much better to have a different rate for tent camping and RV camping. Camping should be \$20 or less, in my opinion, so everyone can enjoy. As a kid I would never had been able to get as connected to the outdoors as I have as it would be too expensive to take a weeks' long trip..

Comments: Camping increase was my primary concern but I do appreciate the way parks have been overrun with many inconsiderate visitors who do not seem to know how to stay on trail and cause damage that needs to be repaired thus increasing costs. I have no idea how to solve for inconsideration but maybe additional education of visitors would be helpful however then people would have to read the materials supplied.

---

Correspondence ID: 89Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,20 2021 02:44:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

From what I read it would make my visit better by having the park in better shape.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I would still visit.

Comments: Thanks for doing a great job.

---

Correspondence ID: 90Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,20 2021 07:48:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It's to much for a day, things are already getting expensive but it feels like you have to be rich to enjoy our national parks.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

That much money to pitch a tent is crazy! If it included heated restrooms and free shower facilities. Camping in national parks should be for everyone not the entitled and rich. I have dreamed of visiting RMNP, but adding a couple of hundred dollars to my week trip is to much for camping.

Comments: I think the supervisor s are over paid and money gets missed used. RMNP does not need to compare it's self to out side campgrounds. Would you jump of a cliff because everyone else is doing it... National parks are meant for everyone not just the wealthy. If wealthy camps want amenities they can go to the out-of-park camp grounds. National park campgrounds are were family memories are made not paid for. Keep them basic and let people enjoy what nature has to offer. Put the money that you have in to the park not the pockets of the supervisors.

---

Correspondence ID: 91Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,20 2021 07:48:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It's to much for a day, things are already getting expensive but it feels like you have to be rich to enjoy our national parks.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

That much money to pitch a tent is crazy! If it included heated restrooms and free shower facilities. Camping in national parks should be for everyone not the entitled and rich. I have dreamed of visiting RMNP, but adding a couple of hundred dollars to my week trip is to much for camping.

Comments: I think the supervisor s are over paid and money gets missed used. RMNP does not need to compare it's self to out side campgrounds. Would you jump of a cliff because everyone else is doing it... National parks are meant for everyone not just the wealthy. If wealthy camps want amenities they can go to the out-of-park camp grounds. National park

campgrounds are where family memories are made not paid for. Keep them basic and let people enjoy what nature has to offer. Put the money that you have in to the park not the pockets of the supervisors.

---

Correspondence ID: 92Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,20 2021 09:10:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I have a senior pass and would not be affected.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I don't use the campgrounds.

Comments: I have no problem with fee increases but am sorry to see that the additional funding does not include the paving of Upper Beaver Meadows Road, a popular road during the summer, that has become a pot-holed obstacle course and embarrassment to the park. Even some annual grading would help. When does this make the priority list? It's way overdue.

---

Correspondence ID: 93Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,20 2021 10:32:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

They would not

I feel the fees have long been lagging behind entrance fees that are charged for other venues. Especially when you think of the increase in the amount of use the park has gotten in the past few years. With the increase, the money needed to handle it needs to be multiplied. Also without the necessary funding the park should do what is needed to keep the park special. With a limited amount of special places that have become national parks, and the increasing population a new way of protecting the natural areas that we can not make more of.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

United States

Not at all

Actually you have waited too long to increase these fees

Comments: See above comments

---

Correspondence ID: 94Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,20 2021 12:44:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I purchase an annual pass so the increase would not affect me. I do know that the Park is in need of upgrades to visitor amenities like vault toilets and trail maintenance, so I hope that the entry fee increase helps with staffing and projects.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I do not use front country campgrounds so the increase in fees would not affect me.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 95Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,21 2021 07:49:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not. We would visit no matter the fee

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It would not, we would continue to visit. Our Colorado parks need all the funds they can get and all the maintenance work required.

Comments: People tend to be less respectful and responsible in our parks. It takes additional funding to maintain and hire staff for basic maintenance let alone damages. Fee increases hopefully help.

---

Correspondence ID: 96Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,21 2021 08:04:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

This fee increase is wrong and should not be implemented. RMNP needs to learn to live within its means, stop wasting money and reduce fees instead of increase fees. Your fee increases reduce accessibility of diverse community groups and continues to make RMNP only a place for elite and affluent. Stop it now!

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I will no longer be able to afford to visit my NPS.

Comments: NO Fee increase. Stop making our national parks only accessible to the affluent and elite. You are restricting access to our lower and middle class citizens and eliminating their ability to experience our national parks. Just say "NO" to your spend, spend attitude and passing the costs along those who can least afford it. Stop it.

---

Correspondence ID: 97Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,21 2021 08:17:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It won't change whether or not I visit. Unfortunately parks have been under funded for years and have a back log of maintenance issues.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It won't change any plans I would have to visit.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 98Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,21 2021 09:59:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would have no impact. I have an annual all NPS areas.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

No. I don't camp at the park.

Comments: This needs to happen. The park has SO much maintenance to do, especially after the fire last year. I think it should go up more than \$5 - it should be at least \$10. This is going to have zero impact on people coming to the park. Also, there are too many people coming anyway, so in the extremely unlikely event that it does keep people away, that's a good thing. Also, it would be great if there was enough money to do new projects after the maintenance is taken care of.

I am a member of the Rocky Mountain Conservancy and have a park license plate. I contribute money to park projects when the Conservancy sends emails about the extra project fund drive. More money for the park is imperative!

On another note - even though I have an annual NPS pass, I think that should also go up to \$100 per year. All NPS areas are

in desperate need of extensive maintenance. The NPS areas mean so much to me and I want to see them taken care of to the best ability NPS has.

I live in Estes Park and I, unlike other people who live here, implore you pass this fee increase.

Thank you,

(b) (6)

---

Correspondence ID: 99Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,21 2021 13:24:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

minimal change. We always try to carpool when we go to a NP

Comments: Topic Question 2:

none. Other family members go, but again, always in a group. They carpool as much as they can.

Comments: My family loves the outdoors and I think the price increases are well worth the outcomes. Less litter, better wildlife protection, better crowd control,out of control fires and less parking headaches.

This management is needed. Thank you for all your hard work and taking care of our beautiful Colorado parks.

---

Correspondence ID: 100Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,21 2021 17:54:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not; RMNP is a treasure and I think the daily fee is a bargain. While a public resource, when comparing it to other avenues for recreation it is a minor investment. I strongly support increasing visitor fees in order to maintain and preserve our national parks.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It would not. I do not camp overnight, but am supportive of a fee increase.

Comments: Not everyone can afford various recreation pursuits; national parks should not be restricted only to the wealthy. But, the fees being suggested are still affordable enough for the vast majority of Americans, and preserving and maintaining RMNP is a critical pursuit.

---

Correspondence ID: 101Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,21 2021 17:57:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I visit RMNP frequently. Increase in fees would not change my use of the park. And when I see the ongoing maintenance issues at the park I would gladly pay more to see some maintenance increased.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I don't camp in the park so increased fees would not impact me.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 102Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,21 2021 20:30:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

An increase to the daily entrance fee would deter us from additional day trips. The price is already steep enough. The services are sufficient. Since we are only a couple of hours away, we like to take out of town guests to visit the park but we would reconsider if the price is increased further.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

We regularly choose to camp there, particularly in the Moraine campground. It is already pricy to camp there for us and our family compared to many other locations. It is difficult to get a site in the summer months already and an increase would add to our consideration. Increasing the fees would cause us to choose to camp in other locations more and visit the park less often. I think families would be impacted the most which is terribly disappointing. National parks should be especially accessible to all and an increase in fees would make it more difficult for the greater population to enjoy the park.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 103Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,21 2021 20:57:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not affect me because I buy an annual pass. This is a great idea, please implement it.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Not at all since I don't camp

Comments: Please implement this proposal, or increase the fees even more!

---

Correspondence ID: 104Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,22 2021 06:05:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

None. I have been calling for the NPS & RMNP to raise fees for decades. There isn't enough money to take care of the park, and every family in the country who takes a vacation can afford the prices now and if they are raised. In fact, I don't think your increase is near enough.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

None.

Comments: I have been calling for the NPS & RMNP to raise fees for decades. There isn't enough money to take care of the park, and every family in the country who takes a vacation can afford the prices now and if they are raised. In fact, I don't think your increase is near enough. Please double or even triple the fees.

---

Correspondence ID: 105Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,22 2021 06:25:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I am FOR the increase in entrance fee. It would not affect whether or not I visit RMNP.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I do not camp so it would not affect me. I would be FOR the increase in campground fees.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 106Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,22 2021 07:31:19  
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not affect my visit to the park. I do think the increase in the daily vehicle entrance fee is important because I think it's time for an increase. I never thought the park charged enough anyway. We need the money to keep the park operating efficiently. The reservation system has made the park and enjoyable experience. I don't think five dollars is really going to impact anybody if they're interested in coming to the park. They have to plan ahead and make reservations in the summer anyway.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I don't think five dollars is really going to impact anybody if they're interested in coming to the park. They have to plan ahead and make reservations in the summer anyway. I think the increase in the campground fee is important. My understanding campers are leaving messes that people have to clean up behind them. And we have to pay for that and also to get rid of all their trash. Until people can learn to respect this park which it seems it's only getting worse not better. I say charge them more. They also need to stop letting anyone have any kind of a fire in the park. It's too dangerous and people are careless.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 107Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,22 2021 11:54:11  
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I buy an annual pass, so the daily fee increase would not affect me. However, I support any increases in daily or annual fees. I believe my visits to the park are worth way more than the current fees. I also believe that the park managers do an excellent job and I would like to see them have more funds with which to work.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I do not camp.

Comments: I am in full support of increasing fees in order to better maintain the park and all of its beauty.

Correspondence ID: 108Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,22 2021 12:03:38  
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

An increase in Daily Vehicle Entrance Fees will affect my visit to the Park greatly. I am an avid motorcyclist and love to ride through the park. By increasing the daily entrance fee, I would most likely not enter the park and would find somewhere else to ride. To increase the daily entrance fee from \$5.00 to \$30.00 would keep me from visiting the park.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I do not camp and therefore, will not comment on this one.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 109Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,22 2021 12:25:58  
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I support the proposed increase in Daily Vehicle Entrance fees, as long as the price of an annual pass does not change. RMNP, and with other NPS units, deserve additional funding to address the deferred maintenance backlog. While charging more for access will inevitably create barriers to entry for low income people, I hope that RMNP staff can find ways to create equitable access for this population. Otherwise, it is absolutely necessary that you increase entry fees in order to finance

necessary maintenance.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I'm not too worried about frontcountry campground fees. That money is sorely needed to address the deferred maintenance backlog, and camping reservations will remain competitive nonetheless. As with increased entry fees, RMNP staff should work to find ways that this policy won't increase barriers to access for low income people. Perhaps reserving a number of campsites for low income households would help to address this issue.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 110Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,22 2021 12:38:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I hold a senior pass. No affect is anticipated.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It encourages more careful and conscientious use of the facilities.

Comments: All citizens of and visitors to the USA need to understand and support the care and sensible enjoyment of our native lands. We need more Park land and greater accessibility and respect for use of such land.

---

Correspondence ID: 111Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,22 2021 12:48:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Email submitted from: (b) (6)

Use (b) (6) to reply to this message

Category: User Fees

I do not object to the fee increase per se. I can and am willing to pay the extra camping fee, I own a lifetime pass to the park so that is unaffected. However I would strongly urge the NPS to open all the available camp sites, almost 1/2 of which have been closed since 2020. They need a bit of cleanup which I would think volunteers could accomplish. I know staffing has been an issue but making the decision now to hire and supplement with more volunteers should suffice to take care of the added camping volume if all the sites were open. Do the math for the added revenue that could be garnered if all the current closed sites were opened!!

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Email submitted from (b) (6)

Use (b) (6) to reply to this message

Category: User Fees

I do not object to the fee increase per se. I can and am willing to pay the extra camping fee, I own a lifetime pass to the park so that is unaffected. However I would strongly urge the NPS to open all the available camp sites, almost 1/2 of which have been closed since 2020. They need a bit of cleanup which I would think volunteers could accomplish. I know staffing has been an issue but making the decision now to hire and supplement with more volunteers should suffice to take care of the added camping volume if all the sites were open. Do the math for the added revenue that could be garnered if all the current closed sites were opened!!



Comments: Email submitted from: (b) (6)

Use (b) (6) to reply to this message

Category: User Fees

I do not object to the fee increase per se. I can and am willing to pay the extra camping fee, I own a lifetime pass to the park so that is unaffected. However I would strongly urge the NPS to open all the available camp sites, almost 1/2 of which have been closed since 2020. They need a bit of cleanup which I would think volunteers could accomplish. I know staffing has been an issue but making the decision now to hire and supplement with more volunteers should suffice to take care of the added camping volume if all the sites were open. Do the math for the added revenue that could be garnered if all the current closed sites were opened!!

---

Correspondence ID: 112Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,22 2021 14:12:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I will stop coming to the park in the winter to winter camp.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I will stop winter camping in Moraine Park Campground, something I have done over the last 30 years.

Comments: Fee increase for winter camping from \$20 to \$35 is too much.

---

Correspondence ID: 113Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,22 2021 15:32:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No affect and I hope the funds are used for salary increases for park personnel and fund tree recovery after the 2020 wildfire.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

N/A

Comments: Keep the funds local. Never allow Congress to get their hands on it.

---

Correspondence ID: 114Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,22 2021 16:11:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Hopefully it would slow down the number of people going into the park. Also, possibly provide funding for more park Rangers to monitor people.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Maybe I could actually get a reservation some day!!

Comments: I hope you raise the fee much more than \$5.00 a day. How about also actually fining people that are feeding animals, going off trails, bringing in their dogs, carving on trees, leaving trash. The park is being abused and no one does anything about it. Lots of people enter the park and I wonder why they want to be there as they destroy nature.

---

Correspondence ID: 115Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,22 2021 21:22:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I have a season pass so that's fine. I support increased fees on cars to incentivize car pooling. As long as this increase doesn't apply to cyclists and peds I'm cool with it.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I'd come much less to camp than I already do. The fees are too high. Especially if I wanted to spend a night camping alone. The fees are already too high. The park is going to be a playground for rich people if we keep raising fees.

Comments: We should be working to get more money from Congress, not nickel and dining the public. Also winter camping should not be the same price as summer camping. It's enjoyable in a different kind of way. Cheaper winter camping allows me to come in the shoulder season and save some money. Now I'll be paying what I'd be paying in June, but I get less daylight and am a lot colder. This is stupid.

---

Correspondence ID: 116Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,22 2021 23:51:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would make me less likely to visit.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It would not affect me.

Comments: I propose that you raise the fee for out of state visitors and leave it unchanged for Colorado residents.

---

Correspondence ID: 117Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,23 2021 09:08:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not affect my visiting at all, we plan to visit at least annually, and my family and I strongly support an increase in fees as this asset must be taken care of and this costs money.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It would not affect my visiting at all, we plan to visit at least annually, and my family and I strongly support an increase in fees as this asset must be taken care of and this costs money.

Comments: It is extremely important to protect, maintain, and evolve funding for our priceless natural park assets (federal, state, local, private, etc.).

As a business owner, I know firsthand good stewardship cannot be done without proper funding. The increase being proposed is nominal and necessary for the greater good of protecting our wild areas. I urge you to increase the fees and my family and I wholeheartedly support this initiative and will continue to visit the park.

PS: I also strongly support bringing wolves to Rocky Mountain National Park as well.

---

Correspondence ID: 118Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,23 2021 10:01:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I hold a senior pass so it would have no effect. However, raising the price to use the national park could impose an huge handicap to people with low income. The parks were set aside by T. Roosevelt and other public minded representatives to allow the common American to enjoy the beauties of their country. Rocky is a special place in that many of its wonders are

visible from a car or after a short walk. If we make the park open only to the well off citizens what will motivate people to protect, defend, and work for the preservation of these special lands.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Already the prices to use the campgrounds are approaching the price of motel rooms. Why should people be penalized for wanting to sleep in the rarified atmosphere of the wilderness. The memories that my children have of the many national parks we camped in are some of their most precious- -and they looked forward to the day when they could take their own children camping. It seems wrong to deny those memories to the less affluent families in our country.

Comments: It feels as though the powers that be want to make the off limits to ordinary people. I trail ride in Rocky and find that often I am excluded due to out dated parking regulations, over zealous temporary rangers, and increasing rules and regulations. If there are too many horses on particular trails, regulate the private companies that take horses in large groups over worn out trails.

---

Correspondence ID: 119Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,23 2021

Correspondence Type: E-mail

Correspondence: Dear (b) (6),

I am writing in regards to a message I heard concerning a fee increase for entrance to our national parks. As a long time visitor and annual pass holder I support the parks and their mission. As a person who generally travels solo or in pairs the current fee structure for most parks is what I consider a single person tax. I see car loads of people and children enter the park in huge vehicles and they pay the same rate that I do on a motorcycle or small car. This system basically using my fee to subsidize their usage and impact. We can all agree that the impact to the parks is much greater by these large groups compared to an individual. There is an opportunity now for the parks to change from a per vehicle fee structure to a per person fee structure. I think the parks would increase their revenue and be more sustainable for future years. I hope that this change might be a consideration one day.

Thank you,

(b) (6)

---

Correspondence ID: 120Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,23 2021 20:17:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It will not, I have a lifetime senior pass. However, even without this, it would still not impact my visits. The value is significant. While I appreciate the lifetime pass, not sure this is a good idea.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

NA sadly I no longer camp.

Comments: I am supportive of the fee increases. The value that RMNP offers is significant and considering you can stay all day this is a great deal. Hiking, scenic views, wildlife, nature, relaxing, therapeutic, photography, Continue the Free Days and make it easy for students to come to the Park. Esp children from low income families and diverse populations.

---

Correspondence ID: 121Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,23 2021 23:56:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would essentially make it so I never come here again. It already sucks all the state parks have a pricey paywall to enter and outrageous camping fees so I can never go to those either. Are our parks only for rich or out of state tourists now? Just one

more way to price people out of life. Thanks!

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It would essentially make it so I never come here again. It already sucks all the state parks have a pricey paywall to enter and outrageous camping fees so I can never go to those either. Are our parks only for rich or out of state tourists now? Just one more way to price people out of life. Thanks!

Comments: Recreation in this state is already prohibitively expensive and inaccessible to people that aren't loaded with money. Probably best to not make it even worse.

---

Correspondence ID: 122Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,24 2021 07:57:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It wouldn't because we usually buy the annual all parks pass. However, what would drastically affect us buying another all parks pass or visiting the park is if you continue to require reservations for locals. I highly encourage, and even beg, for you to exclude Larimer and grand county residents from having to have a reservation to enter. We could show our license on entry to prove we are residents. We only went into the park ONCE last summer and the summer before, even though we had the annual pass for those summers. I can't do winter hiking, so it's rare I can make the trips when reservations aren't required.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I don't mind paying more of it helps the park. But I wonder if there's a way you could help low income people?

Comments: Again. I'm a BEGGING, please don't require timed entry reservations for locals.

---

Correspondence ID: 123Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,24 2021 09:01:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

With the reservation system and increases like this it is naming it increasingly harder to visit at all. Not all of us can plan ahead or have a lot of disposable income. Please stop taking away the parks from those of us without additional resources.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Same. The more money required for these trips the less possible it is to bring my family in.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 124Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,24 2021 09:14:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Go back to staffing the entrance gates fully so you get more money that way. Gates used to be staffed and gathering money until dark.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Go back to staffing the entrance gates fully so you get more money that way. Gates used to be staffed and gathering money until dark.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 125Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,24 2021 14:36:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I wouldn't visit the park with these increases.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I wouldn't camp in the park with these increases.

Comments: The reservation system has to go. It's a PUBLIC park. Not a private club, only available to a few paying customers. We all have paid taxes to the government to secure these lands for public use. And funds have already been set aside for preservation efforts in those taxes. If tax money isn't coming in, perhaps questions should be raised to see where these funds have been sent. Good luck.

---

Correspondence ID: 126Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,24 2021 22:16:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It might increase my enjoyment of the park, by being able to find parking, having less garbage, cleaner toilets, fewer people on the trails and roads, smaller crowds. I plan to visit the park - regardless what the Entrance Fee is - because of the natural beauty of the park. Reducing crowding will help preserve the park for my enjoyment as well as for future generations.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It would not affect my plan to camp at the park at all. The increase is minimal, and will help provide much needed services. Until Congress allocates more funds for our National Parks, an increase of fees is the best way to make sure services do not suffer. Having clean and well maintained camping sites and clean and maintained toilets is important, Ranger programs, bear boxes, good roads, safe tree maintenance, all cost money. Those who do these services should be paid a fair working wage. And there should be enough people to be able to cover the needed work. And housing for workers. All these things cost money. Preserving camping sites is an important thing, so a minimal increase of fees seems necessary to help cover these services.

Comments: Rocky Mountain National Park has become my favorite National Park - because of the natural beauty, and also because of the good stewardship of those who serve us there - both staff as well as volunteers. Thank you!

---

Correspondence ID: 127Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,26 2021 12:12:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

May increase my personal enjoyment in the park as the park may be less busy. It will cause me disappointment as it will further limit access to those less fortunate and unable to afford the visit.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

My visits will continue as I have the ability to pay. I do resent though having to pay so much to enjoy our public parks when increased revenue can easily be obtained by following some of my recommendations in the comments below.

Comments: First off, I love RMNP and have been visiting for over 50 years. The improvements stated seem worthy and I am for anything that enhances a park visit. There are numerous ways to increase revenue without raising prices. Part of the reasoning stated for campground increases was based on nearby comparable campgrounds. Larimer county has the only parks that are comparable on the east side of RMNP. They are nice but very overpriced. Private parks are more expensive but certainly not comparable as they are not supported by our tax dollars. The only comparable you should consider is other National Parks. Just because you can increase prices doesn't mean you should. I look to RMNP to be a treasure and a value.

Some ideas to increase revenue without a price increase are....

1.) Open up ALL the campgrounds

2.) Open up ALL loops within a campground.

If not enough help or host volunteers are available limit certain loops or campgrounds to fully self-contained units and keep the restrooms closed.

3.) Improve the reservation system, do not allow reserved sites to remain empty. If someone does not occupy a site within 24 hours re-rent it. Ideas to limit no shows and no cancellations. 1. When making a reservation make it clear if they do not cancel or occupy the day of the reservation there will be a \$100 no show fee charged to their credit card, the site will be re-rented, and they will forfeit all fees paid. 2. If someone is a habitual no show, maybe 3 times in 5 years with warnings issued every time, ban them from the reservation system for a year.

4.) No more free days. Target any giveaway to those who truly cannot afford the entrance fee. Keep the entrance fee as affordable as possible to encourage all to come.

---

Correspondence ID: 128Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,27 2021 09:23:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The increase in price of a Daily Vehicle Entrance pass from \$25 to \$30 would not necessarily affect a visit to the park. Mostly because it all can still be used towards an annual pass, which many folks do. However, I think it may deter some folks.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I am strongly opposed to increasing front-country campground fees in the park. There is absolutely no need to be comparable in price to privately operated campgrounds. In fact, many people avoid privately run campgrounds and utilize federal campgrounds because of their affordability. As a federal agency, we should not be increasing barriers to recreating on public lands. If the park and the agency are truly committed to making our sites more accessible, especially to marginalized communities, we should recognize that costs associated with recreation are sometimes the greatest barriers such communities face. The \$30 we currently charge is already steep enough. We get lots of folks in the visitor centers mentioning the high campground fee and ask for suggestions about dispersed or Forest Service campgrounds nearby instead. I have specifically never camped inside Rocky Mountain because of how expensive it is. I have camped in Forest Service campgrounds throughout CO because they are generally much more affordable.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 129Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,27 2021 20:36:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No. In fact I think it's a good idea.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

No. I live 1.5 miles from the Beaver Meadow entrance to RMNP but, I think it will be helpful for maintenance of campgrounds.

Comments: Please keep the times entry system. I live 1.5 miles from an entrance to the RMNP so I have first hand knowledge of the timed entry system's success.

I have seen more and more animals coming back to areas they have moved away from. Sheep, in a herd of 20 returning to Sheep's Lake, a Coyote family has returned to Horseshoe Park after a 10 yr. absence, Moose wandering in places they have never been, Beaver in streams that they once abandoned. Even Bear are out and about, they all are less stressed and that is a wonderful site to see.

While trash has been a problem and always will be, I have noticed less this past year.

Please the whole idea of a National Park is to protect and preserve and this system is a HUGE in the right direction.

Ignore the complainers, they are, in my opinion, selfish and can not see beyond the end of their nose.

Thank you.

---

Correspondence ID: 130Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,28 2021 08:33:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

We have a senior lifetime pass, so not at all.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Not at all.

Comments: I am upset that for the 3rd year you are doing reservations. We ended up biking in, but it was so sad that you had an increase in rangers telling people from all over the country they couldn't get in. This is a NATIONAL park, should be open to everyone. Who in say Wisconsin would know about this policy?

We live on the Grand Lake side and we are never crowded. If you want to control crowds why not do reservations for the Estes Park side?

And having rangers at the Easy Inlet trail. That's crazy. Only locals know that's part of the park.

---

Correspondence ID: 131Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,28 2021 09:11:43

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No effect

Comments: Topic Question 2:

No effect

Comments: Please raise the fees even higher for 3 day, 7 day and annual passes. They should be much higher..

Also offer another tier of pass..

Single Park annual pass, no timed reservation needed \$1000/year - I'd buy it in a second. Let's do this.

---

Correspondence ID: 132Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,29 2021 17:17:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not affect me at all. I think the rate should be increased higher to combat the growing demand on the park.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It would not affect me at all. I think the rate should be raised higher to combat the low vacancy rates in the summer.

Comments: If the park decides to keep the timed entry system, PLEASE figure out a way that annual passholders do not need

to pay a fee to make the reservation. I have no problem needing to make a reservation, I do have a problem when I have to fork over more money every time I want to attend when I already spent \$70 to access our parks for the year.

---

Correspondence ID: 133Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,30 2021 11:03:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
Not at all

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
Not at all

Comments: Many thanks for adding funds to help restore the park's damaged areas due to so many people going wherever they want and not staying on the trails.

---

Correspondence ID: 134Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,30 2021 11:59:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

An increase in daily vehicle entrance fee would not affect my visit to the park a lot because if I knew that it was going to a good cause I would most likely be understanding.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
It would not affect my visit to the park.

Comments: Adding an increases of \$5 is not going to affect the upper and middle class but it will affect the lower class. A lot of lower income and diverse families will not be able to afford the park fee increase. The NPS goal is to let everyone go into the parks and have the same experiences and bring in more diverse people and by adding this increase fee it will stop certain people from coming and being able to experience the parks. The \$5 increase may not seem a lot to most people but if a lower class family has been saving for years to visit the Rocky Mountain National Park the fee increase may be the reason why they won't be able to afford visiting and canceling their trip. There has to be other ways to get money for the park improvements and increasing the campground and entrance fee are not it.

---

Correspondence ID: 135Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Nov,30 2021 18:16:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not change my visit(s) to the Park. And most likely would opt to purchase a week pass if there was ANY chance of being there more than one day.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
No personal impact as i do not currently utilize overnight camping.

Comments: Without having visitation data (ie number of one day vs. week passes), i would be in favor of increasing the week pass fee at least by \$10. Please consider this.

For me there is extreme value in the RMNP and these fees are a bargain vs. other 'entertainment options' and are so critical for maintaining the integrity of the Park.

---

Correspondence ID: 136Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,01 2021 11:33:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form



Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
Not affected as I have a Senior Pass.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
Not affected, I do not camp.

Comments: I think the timed entry pass is a good idea, however, some adjustments need to be made. I do not know who/how the passes get snatched up so quickly but I am guessing that individuals get large amounts of passes on the first day of the month. For example: I went on the APP on July 2, there were NO passes for the morning hours for any of the choices for any of the days the second week of August! This does not seem fair for families that plan in advance.

---

Correspondence ID: 137Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,02 2021 12:45:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I have been going into RMNP for years using my senior pass (112 194948.) I consider the pass to be the best result of aging I have seen so far. What's going to happen to those passes?

Comments: Topic Question 2:

No effect. I bought a home in Leadville so we could hang out in the high country. It's been fun re-building the house, as it was damaged a bit as it was dragged down from Fremont Pass.

Comments: I'm willing to re-buy the senior pass, but I am not speaking for all seniors.

---

Correspondence ID: 138Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,02 2021 16:06:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It may limit my visitation, but give me more interest on what the money is going towards.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It would probably limit my visits to the campgrounds depending on the carrying capacity of the campground and how many people were actually there visiting.

Comments: I think the fee increase would be supplemental for the managerial aspect in the sense that it could help maintenance issues of the campgrounds, trails, etc. Unfortunately, it may detract from a certain type of demographic that would like to stay at the campground and invite higher-income and specific demographic that may not be as welcoming when talking about inclusivity. Perhaps the fee could be put in place at peak times in the season and then it drops back down to the regularly priced \$40,50,60 when seasons are at a low? But how does this pertain to equity and giving everyone the same opportunity to experience the same things. Creating a lottery system aimed specifically at lower income communities for affordable permits and/or scholarships for the permit system would be ideal. Issues could also arise with this, so maybe retracting fee's high prices after projects are fulfilled would be the best option.

---

Correspondence ID: 139Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,02 2021 16:29:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Increasing the visitation fees would not be beneficial and also bad timing. It would make a big negative impact for visitors who are unable to afford the admissions to enter the parks. Due to the inflation on the rise and the instability due to Covid, increasing the fees would not be the best solution. Also, this would impact the visitations to the parks by lessening the visitation rates. Since the Covid benefits have ended, people are unwilling to work, visitors will not have excess money to spend. This will cause the visitations rates at the parks to decline.

---

Correspondence ID: 140Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,02 2021 21:15:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Based upon the frequency of my visits to National Parks and RMNP, the increased Daily Vehicle Entrance fee would most likely make me rethink how I spend my time in the park. But in my personal case, it would not affect whether or not I go to the park.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

The increase in front-country campground overnight fees would affect my visit to the park, because I would search elsewhere for a cheaper or even free campsite. Camping and having the right gear is already a great expense, and if you want to have a good camping experience, it's usually preferred to camp more than one night. The fees would add up and it would become too expensive.

Comments: Increasing park fees has its benefits and consequences. Although the money will go towards maintaining park infrastructure and ecosystem mitigation, it will have side affects that effect minorities and others that have limited access to the outdoors and outdoor recreation. For those who have the skill and experience, they might also be able afford the increased fees. The side effect is that the concept of equity gets ignored. Equity is giving everyone access to the same opportunities and focuses on fairness. Not everyone can afford those increased fees and it limits their access to some amazing places like RMNP.

---

Correspondence ID: 141Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,05 2021 17:14:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

An increase to the daily vehicle entrance fee would not affect my visits to the park because I purchase an annual America the Beautiful pass.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

As a solo female camper/traveler, an increase from \$20 to \$35 for the winter campground fee would cause me to substantially reduce my visits to RMNP. It is absurd to increase the winter campground fee by nearly double (especially with fewer amenities made available during the winter). How can RMNP justify this much of an increase for the winter campground fee? In addition, this large of an increase will likely have a negative impact on marginalized and underserved individuals who are in need of more equitable access to national parks and the outdoors in general. Visiting RMNP in the winter is one the best times to visit the park due to fewer crowds and the abundance of winter activities such as winter hikes, snowshoeing, etc. The lower winter campground fee gives people a chance to visit the park who cannot otherwise afford to visit RMNP during the summer due to the summer campground fee and other ancillary reservation/booking fees.

Comments: I sincerely hope the decisionmakers will consider the potentially negative impact an increase from \$20 to \$35 for the winter campground fee would have on park visitors especially those who are marginalized and underserved and lower income earners.

I want to thank the park staff for all that it does to maintain such a wonderful treasure. No matter how many times I visit RMNP, I am always in awe at how well cared for the park is.

---

Correspondence ID: 142Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 08:08:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I almost never buy a one day pass, so no affect in my world.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I rarely over night camp. I feel it is a small enough increase that an individual should not be affected much.

Comments: Rocky.....best place to go.

---

Correspondence ID: 143Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 08:24:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I would be happy to pay the extra fee and still visit

Comments: Topic Question 2:

No change - I generally am unable to schedule camping trips.

Comments: I fully support the fee increase. Our national parks are underfunded and over-populated. Any possible solutions to increase the budget for maintenance should be explored. Thank you for all that you do to keep our natural spaces beautiful.

---

Correspondence ID: 144Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 08:30:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Not at all

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Not at all

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 145Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 08:39:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

100% support Entrance fee increase. I support whatever we need to do to keep RMNP stellar and beautiful. This Sacred land needs to be cared for and maintained until the end of time. If a \$5 monetary increase in entrance fee helps to accomplish this, my Heart is all in.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

100% support campground overnight fee increase. I support whatever we need to do to keep RMNP stellar and beautiful. This Sacred land needs to be cared for and maintained until the end of time. If a \$5 monetary increase in entrance fee helps to accomplish this, my Heart is all in.

Comments: Keep doing what you're doing. It's the right thing.

---

Correspondence ID: 146Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 08:44:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Increases would make it more difficult to bring visiting friends and family to the park when they come to visit. We must bring 2 cars to accommodate everyone and the increase adds up. Also, the timed entry needs to end.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

No affect at all on my visits to the park.

Comments: Living 1 hour from the park, the times entry system has stopped me from visiting at all since 2020. I used to love to pack a picnic and load the kids up when other activities were canceled or the weather was beautiful just to go enjoy the beautiful park, The timed entry system has prevented us from doing that. We miss it, but we've found other mountain spots nearby to visit instead that don't require advance scheduling. Please get rid of the timed entry system.

Correspondence ID: 147Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 08:47:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Increasing fees would have no negative impacts on my visitation. In fact, the improvements that increased fees would allow will be a tremendous positive impact on my visits.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Increased camping fees would have no negative impact on my front country camping experiences or visitation. Camping fees are exceptionally low compared to the value of the experience. Therefore raising the fee makes good economic sense, and it will allow for substantial improvements to various park services and experiences.

Comments: Please do proceed to raise the fees. RMNP is tremendously popular and the current fees are too little compared to the value of the experience that visitors receive. Increasing fees will substantially increase opportunities for RMNP to make critical improvements.

Correspondence ID: 148Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 08:49:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The daily vehicle entrance fee would affect our visit, we purchase an annual all access National Parks pass.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

The increase would not affect our visit to the park, the camping fees are much less than private campgrounds, and an increase would not be a burden. Campground fees are a small portion of a total visit to the park and area.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 149Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 08:49:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Rocky Mountain National Park has woefully mismanaged the national park over the last several years. Revenue most likely has decreased because of the ill-warranted timed entry system which has limited the number of visitors to the park and, thus, slashed revenue. Instead of increasing prices, perhaps an adjustment to the management team and handling of the park would be a better solution. When the top management states that it is her goal to limit people to a national park (which, by the way, is FOR the people), something needs to change in management. This fee increase is nothing more than another attempt to discourage people from visiting.

Correspondence ID: 150Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 08:52:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The park entrance fee is more than enough. Especially when there is already an extra \$2 fee to the park. As a resident and (used to be visitor to the park before a MANDATORY(!!!) \$2 fee for people who have a park pass AND let alone, a racist and bias system towards people without access to computers called the TIME ENTRY(!!!) system which stops a wide diversity of people reaching the park. Overall, the removal of the time system and no raise in the daily vehicle entrance fee should be considered.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
N/A

Comments: I'm quite surprised that I didn't have to pay a \$2 fee to type in this text box like I have to do when I reserve a time slot in the park with an already expensive park pass (seriously, why do I have to pay \$2? There is no TRANSACTION so don't call it a "transaction fee").

---

Correspondence ID: 151Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 08:54:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The increase is very small compared to other recreational activities. The parks need revenue to keep up with their expenses.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
No affect. The increase is small compared to commercial campgrounds.

Comments: These increases are inevitable. Everything costs more, including the parks maintenance costs!

---

Correspondence ID: 152Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 08:55:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Not at all. I purchase an annual pass every year.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
Not likely at all. I am an avid backcountry camper, but I have never stayed in the campgrounds of RMNP.

Comments: I fully support this price increase. Our National Parks are national treasures and need to be cared for with the upmost respect. I know that I am likely not affected by this price increase (based on my answers above). But I would gladly support increases to annual passes and/or backcountry permits as well. Whatever it takes to help.  
Thank you and keep up the good work!

---

Correspondence ID: 153Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 09:14:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

There would be no change in my habits in visiting the park. I do believe this is the best and most efficient way to ensure the park is kept well. I would like to see if there would be opportunities for those who might not be able to afford the cost to have a way to visit.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
There would be no change in my camping habits or visit to the park. The park needs to be maintained for all people to enjoy.

Comments: I grow concerned the population of Colorado is exponentially growing at a non-sustainable rate. I'd like to suggest perhaps a "native" or "legacy" entrance rate for those who can prove their heritage prior to 50 years ago (at this point 1972). We saw and played in the park growing up. Also suggest more open volunteerism in exchange for entrance (not sure what that looks like).

Thank You for your service.

---

Correspondence ID: 154Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 09:21:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

An increase would not change my annual visit to RMNP but I hope there could be a waiver for area residents.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

We love to camp on D loop in Moraine and would be willing to pay extra to support park services. The proposed increase would not change our plans. Closure of D loop the past two years did cause us to stay in a cabin instead of in the park. Restroom construction on the loop in the prior year caused us to leave early.

Comments: I love RMNP and have visited almost every year for the past 30-plus years. I believe our National Parks are America's greatest treasure and want to see my favorite park maintained and conserved forever. I always support extra funding for NPS and support the proposed increase in fees. I have a lifetime pass and hope to visit many more times and when I do, I will continue to respect the park rules and pick up litter wherever I hike, camp, or stop within the park. Everyone needs to do their part to be good stewards and financial support is an important element of good stewardship.

---

Correspondence ID: 155Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 09:22:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

As someone who lives 20 miles from the park entrance, I purchase the America The Beautiful all parks pass every year but 2022 might be the first year I skip it. The crowds and ridiculously long lines to enter (even with the reservation system) have made visiting the park in summer a generally unpleasant experience in recent years. I didn't use my pass to enter the park one single time in 2021. There are plenty of other less crowded free or lower fee options in the area that I will opt for going forward.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Taking my kids camping in RMNP has been an annual tradition for me for the past 15 years, but as referenced above, I probably will find a new place to go now. It's nearly impossible to get a reservation on the weekends between May and September, and raising the rates while doing nothing to improve the facilities just reinforces my hunch to look elsewhere now. Even the perennially grumpy ice cream lady at Glacier Basin didn't bother to bring ice cream last summer. Just lazy...

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 156Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 09:24:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

We will visit much less. We normally reserve 6 backcountry sites at RMNP each year, but this additional cost on top of that will push us away from the park, and you won't get any of that money.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

No effect.

Comments: We appreciate you guys!! But, please, let's not make the park the most expensive in the country!

---

Correspondence ID: 157Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 09:41:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I would be more inclined to support the daily entrance fee increase if it would mean the reservation system would be eliminated. If that is not the case, the increased fee would just be adding to the frustrations required to visit the park. If the

reservation system is staying, I believe a trip to a different park would be a more enjoyable experience and cause less headaches for visitors.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I personally do not usually stay in the park, but I have before and really loved it. What would an increase in the camping fee change about the current number of people staying at the campgrounds? Would the extra revenue be used for maintaining the infrastructure, or for paying the rangers a little more? In my opinion, I think the camping fees should not be changed so that families who are visiting without an excess of money can still stay and enjoy the park.

Comments: I have been a regular at RMNP all my life, and I acknowledge the growing number of visitors, but it feels like the only solutions that have been thought about and discussed with the public are more fees and reservations, which feel like slapping a bandaid on it.

---

Correspondence ID: 158Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 09:47:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I think a \$5 increase is not too bad for a daily vehicle pass, however it worries me seeing all the daily prices going up. At a certain point, if it starts costing me \$40, \$50, \$60 to go into National Parks, it will be a large deterrent from going into the park.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I think the \$15 increase in front country campgrounds is too much. The only way I would want to pay this fee is to split it between a few friends, however these non-group campsites are much too small to split between multiple people and tents.

Comments: As a college student at the University of Montana studying Parks and Outdoor Recreation Management, I understand the need to raise the fees. That being said, as a broke college student, the price increase keeps me from wanting to visit the park. I have been to several National Parks, however as they are getting more expensive and less accessible (i.e. Glacier NP requiring a reservation), I find myself getting deterred from visiting due to the increased prices. The press release said that the prices raised to match the trending fees in nearby campgrounds. If the current fee prices stayed the same, it might encourage more people to visit the park. This could possibly result in the nearby campsites lowering their prices.

---

Correspondence ID: 159Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 09:54:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It is already difficult for families to vacation on a budget in this country. Our taxes are paying for the parks. It will be more difficult for families to enjoy the park.

Some of my fondest memories are when my large family visited the park. Daily fee increases are not a good option for those who are already paying for the parks.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

We will not be camping if these fees are increased. I realize this may be the goal...to keep more people out, however, it is very unfortunate that people cannot enjoy the parks they are already funding with their tax money.

Enforce the increase fees to those who do not live in this country and are visiting.

Comments: The National Park system is funded by American tax payers. Each year there are more and more people from outside the country using our parks. It is a wonderful opportunity for them to enjoy the beauty of our country.

My suggestion is to raise the fee for visitors of other countries. We have this happening in our city. If we don't live in the

county of a facility that is funded by taxes, we pay more. This makes the most sense. Stop punishing those who are already funding these parks!

---

Correspondence ID: 160Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 10:01:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
They would not affect me at all.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
Not at all.

Comments: I'd be willing to pay more. I had the pleasure of living in Colorado from 2016 to 2019 and saw how the HUGE crowds, lack of LNT principles, and overcrowded trails affected the park. The money has to come from somewhere and I hope that the increase in fees will help to preserve the park, mitigate the impact of crowds/vehicles and prevent damage to the ecosystem.

I also hope that the park reinstates the permit system.

---

Correspondence ID: 161Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 10:31:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not impact my visit. I understand I am privileged enough to say this, but at the same time, there must be some form of control to preserve our most splendid parks, that is, the national parks. Otherwise, with the current mass of social media and covid induced travel mania, we will see a very fast degradation of wild outdoor spaces.

Therefore, I highly recommend increasing the entry price, especially for vehicles, as many tourists come in driving and don't do anything else. By increasing the price, we can reduce traffic congestion and more importantly, protect noise/air quality and animal life. Also please set speed limits and enforce them very strictly. So many parks I have been to exhibit the problem of fast drivers racing to get a parking spot.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It would not impact my visit. I understand I am privileged enough to say this. However, I will also say that I generally do not do campground fees (by campground I assume you mean the camp areas dedicated to RVs and other car camping people). I have nothing against car camping, as it is a gateway to actual hiking, but RVing is too much for me.

Therefore, I think that RVers specifically should be charged an even higher price, and campground areas should be restructured to include more spaces for smaller car-camping tent-camping groups. This way, we can reduce congestion, and increase spaces. Also, there should be restrictions on barbecuing, as that is always a huge nuisance wherever I go camp. RVing just seems to be a big contradiction to the spirit of the outdoors. If you can bring a full home with you wherever you go, what's the point? Now you're just using a campground as a change of setting, taking up valuable spaces for actual hikers who need a day off in a campground with facilities.

Therefore, I highly recommend increasing the campground price. The park should increase it even higher than the standard vehicle entry price. The price should be EVEN HIGHER for large RVs.

Comments: I understand that NPS in general wants to keep parks open to everyone, regardless of wealth or status. The problem is, is that many people who come to the parks are here just for the Instagram. Social media has greatly undermined the integrity of our outdoor spaces. One infamous example was the superbloom event in Southern California, which attracted so many tourists that the highway was lined with cars for a mile, and the flowers themselves trampled to death, as people lay on them to take "sexy, inspiring" photos. C.F. (I am an information graduate student at the UW MLS program).



Simply put, there is NO democratic way to preserve outdoor spaces \*and\* at the same time offer affordable and open access to the entire public. As a librarian this is contrary to what \*our\* ethos is, that is to say open access, but we have to remember that both public lands and public libraries have to be maintained by human effort and monetary support. The NPS is already underfunded as it is.

It will only be a strain further on our resources, if NPS lets in too many people, and they cause damage to facilities or set a fire. That will only cost more money, further reducing the enjoyment of the park.

Please, please, consider increasing the price and putting restrictions on RV camping. Other lesser park designations may have more open access, that's fine, but it is paramount to protect our fragile National Parks, especially the ones up here in the Cascadian Northwest, where open space is sparse, and cutting down trees for facilities greatly damages the land.

---

Correspondence ID: 162Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 10:34:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not, I would gladly pay even more to go to RMNP. It's the best national park we've ever been to.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

This wouldn't effect my family because we don't spend the night.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 163Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 11:21:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

My personal experience will not change, as i own a senior lifetime pass. It is long overdue to increase this fee or, better, eliminate the daily pass. Many immediately upgrade to the weekly pass as a "better deal" and it would lessen confusion of purchase options as well.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I do not camp any longer. I feel a more substantial increase would help deter those unwilling to follow rules (food storage, animals, littering, fires, etc.) While not being exclusionary or outlandish given the daily rates for hotels/cabins in the area during the year. Camping is no longer the "simple" vacation of years past. Perhaps even break down fees between tents and large rv rigs, charging more for those using noisy generators. Also adding a caveat for additional fees if violations occur involving weapons or food storage?

Comments: Our Park needs help. Raising fees is not ideal, but, then, neither is requiring timed entry permits. But the ever increasing numbers of visitors makes both a necessity. I wish there a way to make visitors prepare to visit NPS sites - rather than the typical unprepared "what is this place" visitor, who then complains about fees and regulations, and ends up hurting the Park in their selfishness. I would hope all parks could raise fees and implement timed entry systems - it may be the only way to survive. Oh yes - - please consider allowing donations to be accepted at entrance gates rather than strictly at visitor centers. Many visitors ask to add donations when they pay fees, and are incredulous it is not permitted. I realize that increases the processing time per shift report for remitters, but it would be a small increase at worst.

---

Correspondence ID: 164Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 11:30:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

For those of us who live in Colorado and don't fit the rich stereotype, we would still like to use the park. There are a bunch of

hikes that I would like to go do but never will as ill just go someplace I don't have to pay. How about we raise prices for tourists and not residents, or offer a resident discount.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
Again. Make an out of state price.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 165Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Dec,07 2021 11:30:12  
Correspondence Type: Web Form  
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
Fee increase would positively impact my visit to the park, because the increased park income would provide for necessary maintenance and repairs that benefit the park as well as the visitor experience.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
Increased front-country campground fees would positively impact my visits, because it would help pay for necessary maintenance and repairs that positively afuct the park as.well as the visitor experience.

Comments: Thank you to the park service for maintaining such a priceless and important piece of nature. We owe far more than we pay for the privilege of experiencing the park. Most importantly, increased park income will help protect the wildlife and flora of this ecosystem.

---

Correspondence ID: 166Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Dec,07 2021 11:35:02  
Correspondence Type: Web Form  
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
I would be willing to pay more if the reservation system was eliminated like it should be.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
It continues to make our national parks a place for the rich and not for people like me who don't make as much.

Comments: Rocky is continuing down the wrong path by considering temporary solutions such as timed entry, park limitations and increased fees. Rocky is my home and a place that I'm invested in. We need to find a way to move forward in a sustainable manner. I think increasing the size of the park and accessibility are important to the future of this national park. Also, stop advertising for people to come visit and then complaining about how many visitors you're having.

---

Correspondence ID: 167Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Dec,07 2021 11:37:59  
Correspondence Type: Web Form  
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
Depends on increse

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
Depends on increase

Comments: The proposed increase is not reasonable. Not in the slightest. It won't bankrupt individuals but lets talk about the RATE of increase. The proposal is a 20% increase. Inflation is 2-3% annually. The last increase was 25% back in June 2018. At this rate, the entry fee will become prohibitively expensive in a short period of time. I am not against an increase. I would support a reasonable increase. A 20% hike is not reasonable. It is understood that more funds are needed. We have all seen the lines in summer. Let us audit the revenue/expenditures to find out why and how much increase is needed. I'm sure entry fee revenue is currently favorable.

---

Correspondence ID: 168Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 11:44:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I would be fine with an increase as long as it is not too large. Hopefully the extra money can help the park, and it may help stabilize the number of visitors for the time being since it has grown so large in recent years.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I've camped in multiple national parks including Arches, Yosemite, Rocky Mountain and others. They all have a fairly consistent camping price, but the other have shower access and other amenities. I think it would be fair to raise campground prices if some small updates were made to the campgrounds.

Comments: I love the service provided by the park and I appreciate the staff's great efforts to conserve the landscapes natural beauty. Keep up the amazing work!

---

Correspondence ID: 169Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 11:46:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It's not that much of an increase so it wouldn't affect how much I visit.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Even with an increase, it's still cheaper than other campgrounds in the area. I prefer to camp in the park.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 170Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 12:05:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Not at all. I think anyone going to our National Parks should be willing to pay a bit more. Other entertainment venues charge much more for one night events. For example, \$25 a carload to drive around and look at Christmas lights. We need to support our National Parks like the treasures they are.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I do not camp so would not affect me.

Comments: \$5 is the cost of one cup of coffee and people are lined up to buy one. I don't think anyone who loves the Parks, or is even neutral on the topic would mind five dollar increase.

---

Correspondence ID: 171Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 12:18:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The fee would not affect our visit to the park. That is a minimal increase and makes so much sense, given the funds needed to keep the park visitor ready. I would welcome paying the extra fee. We visit RMNP every year from Texas, and want the park to have the funds it needs to continue to welcome visitors in the years to come. We support the entrance fee.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

We would be glad to pay increased campground fees. The proposed amounts are a small increase, and still very affordable. Especially compared to nearby camping and hotel fees. We would gladly pay the increase.

Comments: These small fee increases are very reasonable.

---

Correspondence ID: 172Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 12:19:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not change anything. We love RMNP and understand that sometimes fees must increase.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

For us it wouldn't change anything as we do not camp.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 173Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 12:39:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Not at all. I think increasing the fees is fine. I have a senior pass already so I don't think it will impact me financially other than the \$2 registration fee that the timed entry requires. Hopefully increasing the fees will reduce volume and help you with what you need. The only caveat I would add is that the money gained needs to stay with RMNP.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I've rarely camped so I don't see it as impacting me. Increasing fees would hopefully help with maintenance. Again, the money needs to stay with RMNP.

Comments: I like the timed entry as it seems to have reduced the crazy volumes. I think putting a hard limit on the number of visitors a day might also make sense. Thanks for helping to maintain such a beautiful park.

---

Correspondence ID: 174Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 13:07:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

We will not visit if the fee is increased. In fact, because of your reservation system and the online fee for making reservations, we have not visited in two years. It is unfortunate, but we have decided not to purchase an annual pass anymore. I know several Denver area residents who have made the same decision. It seems to me you are losing more money in people not buying the \$75 annual pass. I am all for a fee to help keep my public lands open and public, but there comes a point where the park starts collecting a "toll" for us to access lands that are already our lands. I believe you crossed that line when you started making annual pass holders pay online to make reservations to enter the park. Rocky Mountain was our favorite National Park, and we loved living just a couple of hours away. Now we are saddened that you are making it so hard for us to even access the park.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I will not utilize your camp sites, even though I want to. The reservation system, the online reservation fee on top of my already purchased annual pass is ridiculous. Maybe less visitors is what you want. I hope many people comment because I do not know anyone in the Denver area who supports the direction this park is going. It is unfortunate we cannot enjoy the park that is our home.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 175Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 13:32:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It wouldn't affect my visits at all. I'm all for increasing fees if it will help keep/maintain our beautiful parks.

Comments: Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 176Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 13:52:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No. I am fine with this. We are thankful to be able to visit the lovely parks. There is no where else a family would be able to go with so many things to do for a small fee. The parks provide so many wonderful memories.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Not at all, fees are reasonable.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 177Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 13:55:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The question is not about me. It should not be about me. Not now and not ever. As guardians of the United States' public lands, the agency should find better ways to address this that are not biased to begin with against folks whose ability to even read and navigate your website is impeded by a different (lower, generally) likelihood to stand up and to raise concerns with government action. Proper stakeholders analysis should be done with more attention given to stakeholders with a lesser likelihood to speak up than the average. The question is, thus, and should be about everyone, and particularly about those whose finances will be affected by the increase because said folks already have limitations upon their ability to visit the park and share with their youth a love of nature and its preservation. I already have difficulty imagining students of mine in high school completion for adults being able to pay the fees as they are, let alone an increased further version of them. I suggest the taking down of the fees altogether if that is feasible. Seemingly RMNP is the only park currently with such a few schedule. Why is that even so? Can the fees be discontinued, please, or made more affordable for visitors?

We are America the Beautiful pass holders. Yet, to some families that pass may be at a prohibitive cost for a one time purchase. Could maybe the fee collected be seen as an installment for an America the Beautiful pass? Today IT permits these things more than ever, and it would not be too much to ask that our government starts to take better advantage of IT progress in its interaction with us customers of government.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

That is already expensive. As above, the issue is more about those least fortunate among us who already cannot afford the cost as it is. Keep the fees low because this way visiting the park and overnight camping in the park is affordable to more visitors. Instead, make the park better known to more potential visitors. Make "premium" purchases, from magnets and board games to other memorabilia and camping gear via partnership with specialized retailers, available for purchase at affordable prices and seek other ways to raise money aside from the entry fee or overnight camping fees. By increasing the park's fame it will increase traffic and repeat visits.

Comments: Use creative and innovative thinking, and keep the park affordable to as many visitors as possible, while focusing on getting the word out about the park to as many young people as possible. Partner with state education authorities and local school districts in said effort. Follow in the footsteps of entities such as FB, twitter or others alike. You can do this. Please do it.

---

Correspondence ID: 178Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 14:27:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

As long as the yearly pass isn't affected it wouldn't impact my family personally. But even the smallest increase can and will affect low income families' which we happen to be. If you do choose to increase the fees, i ask that you provide options or discounts for low income families. We already miss out on so many possibilities die to outrageous costs and feel as if we are being pushed out by the "rich" which isnt fair or right.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

If camping costs were to go up, we simply would never go. As it is we have to save all year to be able to afford to participate in a basic human right, which is absurd in and of itself. I will reiterate the need for low income programs for those of us who would love to enjoy OUR beautiful planet. We are pushed out because we dont have the luxury of throwing away money, especially for something that should cost a fraction of what it does, if anything.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 179Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 15:15:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

None at all

Comments: Topic Question 2:

None at all

Comments: Great idea, except it needs to be more than \$5.00. Parks are always complaining about being underfunded, this is a great way to increase funding. Let the users pay !

---

Correspondence ID: 180Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 15:16:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Would not be able to frequent as much in the Park.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Again, would not be able to stay as long in the Park

Comments: I would like to see fewer "free weekends" in the Park. Unfortunately many of the individuals attracted by this tend to be less respectful of the facilities and the increased numbers cause congestion and damage.

---

Correspondence ID: 181Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 15:16:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Would not be able to frequent as much in the Park.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Again, would not be able to stay as long in the Park

Comments: I would like to see fewer "free weekends" in the Park. Unfortunately many of the individuals attracted by this tend to be less respectful of the facilities and the increased numbers cause congestion and damage.

---

Correspondence ID: 182Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 15:16:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

US 34 is a critical connecting access road for a geographically limited community, and the ability for local residents to use it is essential. Through traffic on highway 34 must not be limited to reservation or charged..

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It probably wouldn't.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 183Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 15:29:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I would likely visit about the same frequency. But in fairness, that's not a proper question. I'll speak to this in the general comment box.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Not applicable.

Comments: My general comment is that the questions above aren't really fair questions. They're structured as they are because you know that by and large, a \$5 increase will not significantly interfere with the 1x or 2x a year visit most folks make to RMNP - at least folks that live outside the immediate area.

The more proper perspective is: this is not an appropriate rate increase. At a time when many American families are struggling, and many costs are increasing, the public parks that we as taxpayers already fund, should not be raising admission fees. This is disrespectful to the taxpayer. When everyone around us is raising prices, our own public parks should not be doing the same.

(b) (6)

---

Correspondence ID: 184Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 17:07:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I am against a fee increase. While I think the money would ultimately be used in a positive manner, I don't agree with putting the onus on day users. With RMNP's reservation system working to help keep overuse down I don't think that a fee increase is necessary to further that goal. I believe that the money needed to further RMNP's stated goals should be sourced from elsewhere in the federal and DOI budget. Visitors who can afford America The Beautiful passes would not be effected by these changes, but day use visitors on tight budgets, potentially from marginalized communities could find the new fees to be prohibitive, which would be in direct conflict with the NPS' previously stated goals concerning inclusivity on the lands they manage.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

See my above answer

Comments: See above

---

Correspondence ID: 185Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 17:50:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It wouldn't. I purchase an annual pass. The \$2.00 fee should NOT be increased if that's what this is about. If it is about increasing the pass to get into the park per day, then that is fine

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I've never been able to camp there, or get a pass, so it won't.

Comments: Do not increase the \$2.00 per day entrance fee that limits the number of people entering. I cherish this, but increasing this past \$2.00 per day is too much.

The increase by \$5.00 for a vehicle to enter is fine. I purchase an annual pass and will continue to do so.

---

Correspondence ID: 186Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 19:15:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No impact to our visits as we are America the beautiful. However, if fees increase RMNP should set aside a portion of the funds to sponsor fees for under privileged youth organizations and veterans

Comments: Topic Question 2:

No impact

Comments: We love RMNP and have always had great interactions with Park Service employees. Thanks for taking care of our natural lands.

---

Correspondence ID: 187Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 20:42:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It wouldn't. While I want to keep the Park affordable, the park needs funds for staff and maintenance.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Same

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 188Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 21:49:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No impact. Will gladly pay the fee.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

No impact.

Comments: Please increase fees necessary to maintain such a beautiful national park.

---



Correspondence ID: 189Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,07 2021 23:00:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would probably enhance my visit. The extra money will help to maintain and improve the park for all visitors with a minimal impact on their pocketbook or attendance.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Again, it would probably enhance my visit and would not discourage me from camping, although that is a rare occurrence for me these days.

Comments: Our NPs are underfunded and behind on much needed maintenance and programs. Please increase the fees to close the gaps.

---

Correspondence ID: 190Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,08 2021 08:59:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

We do what we can afford, increase will not chg visiting RMNP, maybe just how often but there are MANY other beautiful parks in CO to see.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

We are not campers.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 191Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,08 2021 13:01:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I hold a lifetime parks pass. The timed entry fee has already made my mind up to not visit RMNP again so an increase in the entrance fee is irrelevant. There are plenty of places to enjoy the outdoors without going to the Park and that's where I'll be. It's a shame though that you'll still hook the out of state trade while losing a lot of the rest of us. I wonder how Estes will handle the decreased revenue because of your greed.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Not at all. I don't plan to go there.

Comments: I believe that in the long term you'll find that you've shot yourself in the foot.

---

Correspondence ID: 192Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,08 2021 17:31:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The daily fees would not currently affect my visit, however, it would have affected my visit years ago when I had a very low income. I don't know the answer but I feel strongly that National Parks should not be only for the affluent. National Parks are for all people of all incomes.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I would not camp in the park in the winter if the fees were the same price as the summer, especially for fewer services. That's simply ridiculous. I hate that the park is catering to the wealthy and denying the poor. Put on your thinking caps administrators, there must be a better way.

Comments: I camped in RMNP a few years back and was surprised to learn that if someone reserved and paid for a campsite for multiple days, and didn't show up, the campsite was left unused. There were many vacant, but paid-for, campsites. And many willing would-be campers there, ready to occupy the campsites. If you need more funds, simply open the open campsites to others if the first party doesn't show up the first night (or contact the park to say they've been delayed). National Parks are for the "Enjoyment of the People" not for the enjoyment of the affluent people.

---

Correspondence ID: 193Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Dec,08 2021 17:56:47  
Correspondence Type: Web Form  
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
Not at all.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
Not at all.

Comments: The National Parks are worth twice or more what you are charging... I haven't been to Disney World since my kids were young 20 years ago.... It was more expensive then than what you propose now.

I like the two different passes, all of Park and excluding Bear Lake, very equitable.

The Parks have a number of "free days" and those should be kept. Perhaps expanded a bit to be equitable.

Merry Christmas,

(b) (6)

---

Correspondence ID: 194Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Dec,08 2021 20:24:00  
Correspondence Type: Web Form  
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
Negatively, it is already difficult with a lower income to visit the national park.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
Negatively, it is already difficult with a lower income to camp in the national park.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 195Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Dec,09 2021 07:11:14  
Correspondence Type: Web Form  
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

While an increase to the daily vehicle entrance would not directly affect me as I am a continually returning annual pass holder, I get concerned over what this will do to lower income families and families who would not otherwise visit the parks. The national parks are "for the people" and should be treated as such. We should not increase pricing as this will only affect those who need the parks most. Lower income families, historically non-white families, inner city families, etc.

I recognize the distinct conundrum that RMNP is in as one of the most visited parks in the US, however I would be more in favor of continuing to utilize the reservation system, at no cost, than a blanket increase.

Comments: Comments: RMNP is home, and always will be, but this home needs to be accessible to everyone, at a price point that does not deter anyone.

---

Correspondence ID: 196Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,09 2021 16:17:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Be sure to revamp bicycle entry fee. Doesn't make since that I can buy a weekly car pass and haul in a bike, take up a parking space, and contribute to auto congestion for \$35 for the week for 16 people.

Or pay \$15 a day per person to ride my bike in. A weekly bike pass for up to 2 ( or 4) riders should cost the same as a weekly car pass and be able to purchase online.

There was great confusion this fall on how to purchase a bike pass from a very rude attendant when we rode our bikes to the park from the campground we were staying at AND we had a weekly car pass. We just rode back, loaded up the bikes in the truck and went into the park. Kinda silly, but we followed "the rules", drove in and took a trail head parking space.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

No impact as I prefer electric and water at campsite.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 197Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,10 2021 06:01:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Because I buy an America the Beautiful pass, the increase would not affected financially and should only be an overall benefit by increasing funding to the park

Comments: Topic Question 2:

The fee change is not likely to impact the trip

Comments: The fee increase seems like a needed step. It would be nice to see outreach and assistance to get more local, disadvantaged and underrepresented citizens to the park with some of the additional revenue

---

Correspondence ID: 198Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,10 2021 09:11:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The increased fees to the Park would allow trails to be better maintained, toilet facilities to be kept clean, and no overcrowding on trails. When too many people are in the Park at any time, experiencing nature is diminished. The environment needs to be protected, i.e., animals, vegetation, air quality. These price hikes are long overdue. I fully support the increases proposed.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

My children and grandchildren would need to pay higher campground fees, but I would fully support the increase so these areas would be properly. maintained

Comments: In order to keep Rocky Mountain National Park a place to experience the beauty and wonder of nature, it is essential that funds be available to maintain it. The Park has been open on free days, so people who cannot afford entry fees can still visit. It has been my experience that very poor people do not come to the Park, because they cannot afford the expense of even getting to the Park. That leaves mostly middle income families who would be affected by an increase in fees. For these families, especially large families, it will be a bargain, even at the fees proposed. It is crucial to attend to damage to

the Park from environmental effects as well as wear and tear caused by visitors. Please put the proposed fees into effect, so our beautiful RMNP can exist in all its beauty for generations to come. It is a treasure!

Correspondence ID: 199Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,10 2021 13:35:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

An increase in the daily vehicle entrance free would not do much to me as I am an annual pass holder. I am extremely concerned that this increase in price will marginalize part of your visitation base. An amount of \$5 can either seem extremely minimal but can also seem like a monstrous task for a father who just wants to show his family the outdoors for a day. I think Increasing the price will not only make it harder for working class Americans to practice their right to public lands. I also can see families skipping over the park and choosing a cheaper campsite with USFS outside the park's gates.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I would choose not to camp inside the park if there was an increase in price. I would check for free permits as well as local BLM land and USFS land. The Increase in price gave no evidence for growing visitation and the need for more park created funding. Instead, they listed problems every big park faces. "Bear Control", "Trail Repairs" are just a few problems big parks run into every year. In my opinion I would not jack up the entrance free just because I can. I would search out volunteer efforts to help with my parks listed problems as well as ask for funds from the Nature Conservancy or NPCA. I think raising the price will ultimately do worse than good.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 200Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,12 2021 06:36:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have no problem with the Park increasing fees for anything because I understand how much money it cost to keep the Park open and maintained. My only problem is being able to drive through the Park to get to the other side. I never want to visit the Park anymore because it's a total cluster fuck. All I want to do is drive through it to get to the Western slopes or come back from the Western slopes to get home. I do not think I should have to pay more the \$10-15 to drive once through the Park. I would even buy a punch card pass that would include 10 straight through drives for \$100, seems fair. Again, I have absolutely no desire to visit Rocky Mountain National Park, I just want to drive through it.

Correspondence ID: 201Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,12 2021 07:35:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not; I have a lifetime senior pass.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I camp infrequently, so can absorb the increases ok

Comments: Fully support the fee increases and reservation system to maintain the parks and prevent overcrowding; too many people at one time can spoil the visits and overburden the park.

Correspondence ID: 202Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,12 2021 13:11:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe the rise in vehicle entrance fee and campsite fee will be of a benefit to the park as well as that of the public. Money that is acquired will be going to the various projects that will lead to the betterment of the park and visitor experience. Though some visitors will have negative feedback this is what is required for the improvement of Hazard Tree Mitigation, Wilderness Trail Repairs and Improvements, Wilderness Campsite Improvements, Bear Management, and

Restoration of Historic Rock Walls along Trail Ridge. These aid to the betterment of the park itself and the enjoyment of visitors.

---

Correspondence ID: 203Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,12 2021 13:26:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: After reading the news releast about increasing the parking and camping fees at Rocky Mountains National Park, I believe that that increasing the amount that visitors must pay for using the national parks amenities is a good idea. Knowing that the money increase will go towards various projects that will improve the trails and management, this form of direct management could prove to be very rewarding. Although an increase in price could result in an an issue of wealth inequality, the results of the park improvements could allow for more equity due to their focus on improving trails and roads. Because the extra five to fifteen dollars will be going towards maintenance of campsites, roads and hiking trails, I would not mind paying for it. Overall, I think the price increase is a very good idea but would hope to find other options in the future to avoid National Parks from becoming too expensive.

---

Correspondence ID: 204Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,13 2021 15:39:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe this proposed increase in fees at Rocky Mountain National Park is an important and necessary change. The increase in entrance fees will allow an increase in funding towards Hiking Trail Repairs and Improvement, Hazard Tree Mitigation, Wilderness Campsites Improvements, and more. All of these improvements will increase visitor safety and experience overall. Not only will the increase in fees go towards improving the park, but it also helps the National park recover from COVID-19. Last year, national parks and outdoor recreation areas received a large blow to their usual funding from visitor entrance fees and visitor spending in general. The increase in entrance fee will allow the park to keep running smoothly, and maybe even better than before the pandemic!

---

Correspondence ID: 205Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,13 2021 15:42:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As an avid visitor of Rocky Mountain National Park I 100% support the proposed 5\$ raise in park entrance fees. The fees will be helping the park make up for lost funding during covid-19. I would love to see projects the park has in mind that will be completed with the increased profits that will be coming in if this becomes a change in the future. A 5\$ up charge would benefit all users of Rocky Mountain National Park and increase the overall experience. I do encourage the NPS to keep in mind how this could close the door to people who have never been to the park due to financial restrictions.

---

Correspondence ID: 206Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,14 2021 15:48:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
No effect, as we have a senior pass.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
No effect; we can afford the increase.

Comments: I would like to see more equitable access to all our national parks. One way this could be achieved is with public transportation. CDOT initiated Bustang to Estes Park this year. This needs to continue nd RMNP should help facilitate shuttles into the park from Estes. Public transportation helps seniors and low income people access our national parks. In addition, it helps reduce congestion, pollution and carbon emmissions, all things that should be of concern to the national parks.

---

Correspondence ID: 207Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,14 2021 18:32:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The fees and the reservation system both will reduce if not eliminate my visits to the park.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I won't camp there overnight.

Comments: By requiring reservations and increased fees you have and are discouraging citizens from visiting the great outdoors and being able to see and enjoy our national park. The reservation system is clunky and requiring reservations puts up a barrier preventing many from visiting. Plus, technology can be challenging and this reservation system requires people to have advanced knowledge of apps and technology. I am so disappointed that your actions prevent us from visiting the park. It is truly disappointing that the public is being deterred from visiting our national, supposedly public, park. You used the excuse of the pandemic to implement a system you have long wanted to put in place and it deters people from being able to visit. Is it our park that their tax dollars have paid for and your actions pre luxe visitation.

Correspondence ID: 208Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,14 2021 20:24:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The increase would not impact my ability to visit the park. I would appreciate the improved maintenance and care for the park.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

The increase would not impact my ability to camp at the park. It would likely make the campsites better, the trails would get needed improvement too.

Comments: Parks cost a lot to maintain and it's critical parks such as RMNP get the love and care that are needed to keep the landscape and wildlife healthy and visitors safe.

Correspondence ID: 209Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,15 2021 06:23:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I typically visit the park 2-3 times a year by bicycle. This is primarily to ride Old Fall River Road (up and back or thru to Grand Lake) while it is closed to cars during shoulder seasons. It appears that the proposed change does not affect bicycle or walk-in fees, which at \$15/visit, already seem really high for what amounts to a 2-4 hour ride on a dirt road that is only car free and passable a couple weeks of the year.

Since there is only a proposed increase to vehicle daily entrance fees, this would not really affect my visit directly. Indirectly, it doesn't seem like there would actually be fewer vehicles, but there may be more people driving faster or more recklessly due to the cost increase. That's unlikely in the vast majority of drivers, but it seems like bicycle safety gets worse every year up there.

I would probably see a net benefit in the quality of the park with an increase in Daily Vehicle Entrance Fees.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I don't think there would be a significant difference to me. I haven't used RMNP front country campgrounds and don't intend to due to restrictions that apply to dogs on trails in national parks - I would likely use other nearby campgrounds first.

I would probably see a net benefit in the quality of the park with an increase in front-country campground Fees.

Comments: It would be nice to have old fall river road closed to cars a few times during the summer, it would make the already-difficult ride more accessible to new cyclists that want to try it but may not feel comfortable doing it in shoulder seasons.

In general, I support increased fees to use public lands. It's hard that it may be a financial strain on some, but I think parks clearly need more funding.

It does seem like RMNP fees are so close to annual passes, I would be concerned that increasing use fees would end up reducing the actual revenue of the park. Has this been studied? For me personally, a use fee this high for vehicles BEGS for people to just upgrade to the annual pass - it now pays for itself in 3 days of visits to RMNP instead of 4.

---

Correspondence ID: 210Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Dec,17 2021 17:14:20  
Correspondence Type: Web Form  
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
Very Little, if at al.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
Not at all- -I don't use these services.

Comments: RMNP has two problems: 1. Overuse, causing excessive wear and tear; 2. insufficient funding resulting in deferred maintenance. Both of these problems could be ameliorated by raising fees enough to so that some kind of balance between park usage and revenue for needed maintenance is achieved. I doubt that a five dollar increase will do it. You should have congestion pricing; i.e. more popular times to enter the park are more expensive. Likewise, more popular parts of the park who'd cost more. Fees should be high enough that, most of the time, a person should be able to by a park pass on the spur of the moment if they want.

Current park fees are an incredible bargain, and should be raised ro reflect the value received by park visitors.

Thank you

---

Correspondence ID: 211Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Dec,18 2021 15:33:53  
Correspondence Type: Web Form  
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
I support a fee increase. This park obviously needs some funding to take care of some things!

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
We would pay whatever to visit this park.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 212Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Dec,28 2021 11:26:06  
Correspondence Type: Web Form  
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
I support the increase and would gladly pay.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
I don't usually camp but support the increase.

Comments: People need to realize that it takes employees to maintain all of the national parks and they should be supported since the government does not provide enough funds. As a Colorado native, i enjoy this park several times a year and I think timed entries are great as well.

---

Correspondence ID: 213Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Dec,28 2021 13:49:12  
Correspondence Type: Web Form  
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
Not visit as often

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
Not visit as often

Comments: Seems crazy that we have to pay anything to visit a "National Park", let alone having the price increase to \$30...it's an obscene amount which will decrease the volume of visitors to the park, but doing it in a way that discriminates to those that can afford it! I would rather see a minimalistic approach to the visitor centers...making the experience more about the "Park" not about the buildings.

The more we restrict access to any "Park" or National forest, the fewer people get to experience the wonder and the less important it becomes, thus further reducing the funds and interest in maintaining or investing in any "Park" or forest....

I never see anything about requesting volunteers to help, or to contribute...

If the population has increased to the point that the access needs to be limited versus deterioration of area...I'd rather see the area deteriorate...that's just the results of overpopulation or over growth

(b) (6)

---

Correspondence ID: 214Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Dec,28 2021 16:56:59  
Correspondence Type: Web Form  
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
Increased fee's

Comments: Comments: I feel this not right as the economy is in the tank you are wanting to raise fee's. People will not be able to afford this and no one will be able to go.

---

Correspondence ID: 215Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Dec,28 2021 17:08:31  
Correspondence Type: Web Form  
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
I will still come to the park! I welcome the higher rate to fund restoration and improvements.

Comments: Topic Question 2:  
RMNP camping fees are affordable. We camp every year. I would charge more for RVs since they leave a larger Footprint and impact on the park and campsites. I would like to see tent camping stay at \$30. But the \$35 proposed increase will not stop me from coming. I can afford that (but I'd like it to stay affordable to all)

Comments: I'm okay with increasing the rates to help control traffic and pay for the massive influx of visitors. While our National Parks are an asset given to all citizens, the bathrooms, picnic tables, shuttle buses, shelters, parking lots,



and other infrastructure is above and beyond the park land itself and all of it needs to be taken care of. Our Rangers and park personnel need to be paid and my guess is they are overworked since current fees can't allow for more hiring. We need to generate more monies to pay for the equipment and supplies that keep the parks clean and safe. Parks we're designed so long ago they could not have foreseen the growth and traffic they encounter today. Small increases in fees over time seem to be a way to help. Thank you!

---

Correspondence ID: 216Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Dec,28 2021 17:08:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I will still come to the park! I welcome the higher rate to fund restoration and improvements.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

RMNP camping fees are affordable. We camp every year. I would charge more for RVs since they leave a larger Footprint and impact on the park and campsites. I would like to see tent camping stay at \$30. But the \$35 proposed increase will not stop me from coming. I can afford that (but I'd like it to stay affordable to all)

Comments: I'm okay with increasing the rates to help control traffic and pay for the massive influx of visitors.

While our National Parks are an asset given to all citizens, the bathrooms, picnic tables, shuttle buses, shelters, parking lots, and other infrastructure is above and beyond the park land itself and all of it needs to be taken care of. Our Rangers and park personnel need to be paid and my guess is they are overworked since current fees can't allow for more hiring. We need to generate more monies to pay for the equipment and supplies that keep the parks clean and safe.

Parks we're designed so long ago they could not have foreseen the growth and traffic they encounter today.

Small increases in fees over time seem to be a way to help.

Thank you!

---

Correspondence ID: 217Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,02 2022 09:08:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Being on a limited income the increase in entrance fee would reduce the number of times we could visit the park coupled with restrictions of timed entrance, that now seems to be an adopted full-time policy, makes it seem as though the park system is not interested in creating an easy way for visitors to experience public land or at the very least, restricting the park to only those that can afford it.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Again, During this time it seems unrealistic to impose higher fees on anyone.

Comments: My family has always loved the National Park System. As of late, we are very discouraged with not being able to visit our public lands in a way that we had done before. The timed ticket entry is extremely inconvenient and restrictive, that, coupled with a proposal to raise entrance fees seems uncaring, ill-conceived, and done with no regard to the people that support our public lands and wish to visit them in a way they were meant to be experienced.

---

Correspondence ID: 218Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,02 2022 15:50:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not ... I have a senior pass.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I am a senior, and camping in Timber Creek Campground is not very nice now that all the trees are gone, plus being a senior, we camp to save money and not go to a hotel/motel. So the camping fees are already very high in RMNP compared to state parks, so make our senior pass give us a substantial discount and keep the fees low for all those who cannot afford going to hotels/motels as camping should be. We would not be able to afford as many nights as in the past.

Comments: Same as above.

Correspondence ID: 219Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Jan,15 2022  
Correspondence Type: Letter  
Correspondence: RE: Fee Increases

We are fully in support of the proposed fee increases for Rocky Mountain National Park that will assist with the maintenance of campsites, etc.

Our beautiful park needs more federal funding to also assist with the damage caused by the fires and flooding. Hopefully, more will be coming soon from this administration.

Sincerely,

(b) (6)

Correspondence ID: 220Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Dec,15 2021  
Correspondence Type: Letter  
Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern:  
Below are my comments regarding the proposed fee increase at Rocky Mountain National Park.

With regards to vehicle fee increase, in my opinion the increase is fair and respectable. As far the increase would affect visiting Rocky Mountain National Park, it would have zero affect.

However, with regards to proposed camping fee increase I have no comment or opinion due to I have never camped in Rocky Mountain National Park.

Correspondence ID: 221Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Jan,04 2022 08:13:08  
Correspondence Type: Web Form  
Correspondence: Topic Question 1:  
It would not affect my visit, I would be happy to pay an additional \$5/day to support the park and NPS. It's a small price to pay for maintaining and caring for the places we love.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I think it would be great, again the park needs a much support as possible. People take for granted what it takes to make these campgrounds possible.

Comments: I think these proposed increases are a great idea and much needed. The destruction from the fires in 2020 and increase of tourism has left a significant impact on the park. The park needs these extra funds to help maintain one of the most magical places on this earth. Thank you NPS for all that you do.

Correspondence ID: 222Project:105454Document:116600  
Received: Jan,04 2022 08:18:26  
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not affect me, as I buy an annual National Parks pass.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It would not affect me, as I never camp in Rocky Mountain National Park.

Comments: I understand the need for more funds, between lack of federal funding and other outside factors like inflation. I just hope the increase in daily vehicle fees doesn't negate the ability for those less privileged to visit. It would be nice if there was something in parallel to help those underfunded, like additional free days.

---

Correspondence ID: 223Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 08:19:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I make an annual trip to the park & would fully support an increase in fees to help with improvements and upkeep of the park. It is a national treasure & would love to keep it nice.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It would not affect me. I support it.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 224Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 08:30:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

An increase in Daily Vehicle Entrance fees would not affect my visit to RMNP. I agree with the proposed increase. The park needs more funding for maintenance, repair and restoration, especially in view of the heavy use it gets.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

An increase in campground overnight fees would not affect my visit to the psrk. I agree with the proposed increase.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 225Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 08:33:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Would not affect me, but I support the increase. I buy the annual season all-parks season pass each year.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Would not affect me, but I support the increase! My family chooses to disperse camp on forest service roads, and typically would not camp in the main campgrounds in the park.

Comments: Full support! In an ideal world, our federal and state governments would see the value of our public lands and increase funding coming from the top. Absent of this change of heart, raising fees is necessary to keep our parks pristine! With the increase in visitors to RMNP along with the huge population growth on the front range, I have personally seen the increase in damage and wear and tear to parking lots, bathrooms, trails, and other facilities as a result.

Might I suggest that RMNP offer a discounted "locals" pass to the park for residents of Larimer and Park counties? ...does that already exist?

---

Correspondence ID: 226Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 08:38:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It could have a positive influence with the proposed improvements. However, this increase should be solely applied to out-of-state visitors.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It would not.

Comments: Relative to the times entrance aspect that has been put in place in the past couple of summers, this is ABSOLUTELY not be applied to Colorado residents OR to annual/lifetime pass holders. We live in Boulder County yet during the summer only visited once despite being pass holders and despite trying to "reserve" a spot for entry. Additionally, while it's only \$2, the reservation fee is insidious and negates the pass if someone visits enough.

---

Correspondence ID: 227Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 08:48:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Not much since I generally hold a national park pass

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Most likely would not camp. The camp spots are already pretty snug together I wouldn't say my top national park place to camp so increasing the fee for not getting much of a serene camping experience wouldn't be worth it.

Comments: With so many tourists and transient residents that don't generally obtain a Colorado license or residency I think applying an increase to non locals would be ok. But anyone whom is a Colorado resident this should not be applicable too. When I lived and went to college in Hawaii being a non-resident I had to pay to enter various parks whereas they had it set up that locals did not which I thought was a great idea.

---

Correspondence ID: 228Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 09:02:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

As a US citizen and taxpayer shouldn't I have free access to MY park and the US Highways that run through it.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

The camping fees are already high for primitive campsites.

Comments: Your reservations system for accessing the park completely stinks. Really make a reservation to go to the wilderness.

---

Correspondence ID: 229Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 09:07:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

No, we buy the annual national parks pass.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It may help limit some attendance, the park is way over loaded as it is. Otherwise, it wouldn't have any effect on my use of the park as I backpack, not camp with the rv's.

Comments: I think raising fees to better manage the park and limit the number of visitors is exactly what needs to happen. Our parks are being destroyed by over use and lack of money to manage the crazy attendance numbers.

---

Correspondence ID: 230Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 09:18:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I fully support increasing the daily fee. It is a small amount, comparatively, and will help keep our parks well-tended.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Increasing fees here is also well-warranted. I fully support this measure.

Comments: Please keep the seasonal timed entry system! It may be mildly inconvenient, but it is beneficial for the locals and the park. Park traffic has gotten ridiculous, and I worry for our natural areas. I also believe that traction laws and AWD/4WD requirements should be instituted sooner in the year than they were this past season, and more rangers are needed to manage the populace, as I've seen many people disrespect our trails, forests, and lakes this winter. I step in where I can, but Rangers would be ideal. I've also encountered many unprepared hikers this season, which worries me, though I'm not sure there's much to be done about that.

---

Correspondence ID: 231Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 09:18:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

As a local, my family purchases the annual National Park pass, to me, the increase would have no effect. I do understand that many do not have the pass and \$5 may be a lot to some. However, as a weekly visitor of the park, I have seen the negative side effects from the increase of visitors from trash left on trails, to people walking on protected areas, and even getting too close to wildlife. I think an increase would be great to help the park get more funding to focus on protecting the park even more.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I haven't camped in the park yet, but I have camped in Estes Park and the campground fees in RMNP would still be cheaper than the campgrounds in town, even with the increase.

Comments: I think the increase would greatly impact the park in a positive way. Especially with the increase of visitors each year.

---

Correspondence ID: 232Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 09:21:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would decrease amount of times I would go. The parks are already supposed to be America's and for the people. There shouldn't be an entrance fee for lands designated for the people. Tax dollars are already provided for these lands

Comments: Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 233Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 09:22:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

This would not affect me and I have no objections. I always purchase an annual National Parks pass.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I am against this. Increasing camping fees decreases access to people wanting to visit the park and discriminates against lower-income households.

Comments: I am all for increasing park revenue to better maintain & protect this important natural resource, but would like to see it done in a way that does not negatively impact people in lower-income brackets.

One idea would be to add campsites with electric hookups and charge more for those sites. People driving RV's are more likely to pay higher fees; this way you could still charge a lower rate for tent campers.

---

Correspondence ID: 234Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 09:29:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I'm definitely in support of an increase in the entrance fee. I know the money goes to the park and I think we should be investing in our outdoor spaces to protect them and educate people about our environment. This won't hinder me from visiting the park.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

As mentioned above, I am in complete support of increasing the fees and it wouldn't affect my visit to the park. I'm happy to spend more money if it will help protect our lands.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 235Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 09:47:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Wouldn't affect my visiting the park again. I don't use camping services, but fully support the increase

Comments: Topic Question 2:

NA

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 236Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 10:05:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

For a casual visitor, the difference between a daily and the current weekly fee of \$35 will be so insignificant that they will probably purchase the weekly pass. IMO, the fee increase is needed but without increasing the weekly fee by \$5, then most visitors will just purchase the weekly pass and the Park will not get enough additional money to make it worthwhile to increase the fee. However, if both weekly and daily fees are increased by \$5 each, then the daily fee might be seen as not a big financial burden. Plus the park would benefit with both fees increased.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I would not be impacted by these fees in the summer. The increase in the winter fee would be okay as it will still be affordable to me, and the campground can always use the additional fees for maintenance and upkeep.

Comments: I think that the weekly pass fee should be increased. But as a frequent user of many of the US fee areas (mostly NPS-administered), I purchased an annual pass until I qualified for the Senior Pass. However, I still purchase the annual pass for another as a yearly gift, so I still feel the fee increase.

That said, I visit RMNP at least monthly if not more and am frustrated by the long lines at the Beaver Meadow entrance, especially when there is an electronic gate that can handle those of us who have the passes that can be read automatically. I can see in the peak season where you have a version of metering operating but in the off-season times, there is no reason not to have that option available.

The other thing is to not have the ability to purchase a RMNP daily or weekly pass at the visitor center rather than right at the gate. That truly holds up traffic and makes the ranger staff there become more of a retail clerk (nothing wrong with that, I've been one) rather than a ranger that can address more "ranger" type questions.

As this comment time is mostly to address fee increases, I think a \$5 increase in the three tiers of RMNP entrance passes (daily, weekly, annual) is manageable for most of the population, although I know at this time only the daily fee is being proposed for an increase.

The additional fee increase for the campgrounds is also doable, and more important, necessary. This park is being "loved" to death and I see it on the trails and in the various facilities around the park. If an additional fee will help to maintain and hopefully, improve the facilities around the park, I say "YES".

---

Correspondence ID: 237Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 10:17:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Daily fee would not affect me because we buy an annual pass.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Would not deter me from camping in the park

Comments: If a fee increase is enacted, I would request that those of us that "live full time" next to RMNP be exempted from the reservation system. We live in Grand Lake for a reason which in part is access to RMNP, it is a travesty to us locals that we must make reservations to visit our backyard. Imagine, if you will, that you live next to Wash Park in Denver and in order to "use" the park you needed to make a reservation, that would be ludicrous. It's the same up here, except we have a lot fewer residents to create an uproar as compared to Wash Park.

Another aspect to consider for locals and the reservation system is generally we do not know our schedule from week to week, unlike tourists who may plan months in advance. This puts us at a distinct disadvantage when trying to use our backyard.

---

Correspondence ID: 238Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 11:13:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I'll pay more to be able to actually park and enjoy bear lake. However I know for some friends this increase will make the park a no go and unaffordable will they have a low income option so those families can visit to?

Comments: Topic Question 2:

We could never find a site anyway I wish nps would reserve some spots for locals to enjoy camping too we always do out of the park unfortunately. If by some miracle I could get a site in Rmnp I would hope more bear containers are added like olive ridge each site has its own. Camp sites are already spendy so I would want some additional benefits

Comments: Timed entry was fine but sometimes no spots available for us local to use a day off in Estes we haven't been able to get camping reservations for years either, some spots should be saved for locals to enjoy their backyard too. I'm hoping nps will have a low income option for families that already can't afford rmnp. We love Rocky Mountain national park. With covid it would be nice if more restrictions were made for out of state visitors to slow the spread look at ski country right now sometimes it's best to close the door to international travel in a pandemic

---

Correspondence ID: 239Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 11:59:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I couldn't afford to visit the park. As it is we can only budget to come once or twice a year.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

N/A

Comments: I think federal funding from taxes needs to be re-examined and increased. All parks are seeing a huge increase in traffic (some more than others obvs.) and the current funding isn't realistic for the needs. Raising fees will just increase the level of entitlement people have to do whatever they want in the park (I paid more to have someone pick up my trash etc). As crappy as that is it's the reality.

As for campgrounds, a sliding scale based on size of camper/type of camping makes the most sense to me. Bigger campers take more space and are responsible for more wear and tear on the roads.

---

Correspondence ID: 240Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 13:32:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not, I have a National Park Pass. I do believe that the ask to increase \$5 is appropriate. For each vehicle, this is small increase, but for the park overtime this seems like it could be very helpful in maintaining the park.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I have never camped in rocky before sadly, but if I were to the increase in fees are not an issue.

Comments: I think this is overall a good initiative. Rocky is such a popular park, and because of this I'm sure requires more work to maintain than other parks. One improvement that really stood out to me is the hazard tree mitigation. With climate change and the increase risk of dryer weather and fires, this alone is worth the increase in fees. The last thing we want is for all of the areas everyone loves to be destroyed.

---

Correspondence ID: 241Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 14:14:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I support the increased fees to fund the projects needed to maintain the park and allow visitors to have a positive experience.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I support the increased fees to fund the projects needed to maintain the park and allow visitors to have a positive experience.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 242Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 15:48:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I visit in the summer months when on vacation. This increase in fees is reasonable. It would not deter me from visiting. I would suggest if the fees are changed start getting the information out there so people know ahead of arrival at the park. I really think an increase of \$10 should have been added to the annual pass.

Comments: Topic Question 2:



I have not camped in front country campground. The proposal said that this increase in price was comparable to campgrounds in the area. The state park charges should be the same as other private campgrounds. People are getting the experience of camping inside the park. It takes money to try and maintain parks that are getting smothered with visitors

Comments: I think the annual pass should be \$80. The \$70 is too low. If the day pass is raised the annual pass should be raised also. I think that would be fair. I assume annual pass holders go more frequently.

---

Correspondence ID: 243Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 16:23:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

For me it would not impact my usage at all. I feel the entrance fee is a bargain.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

An increase in campground fees would not have any negative impact on my usage. I feel the fees are a good value and well worth it. Some people pay large amounts of money for a camper. The camping fee is a fraction of this cost.

Comments: I think the fees are below what they should be. Compare the fees to the alternative. A family can enter the park and camp for the price of a family going to the movies. Try that at Disney World. Honestly I wish you would raise the fees enough to eliminate the maintenance backlog.

---

Correspondence ID: 244Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 17:06:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not, I have a lifetime pass

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It would not

Comments: I disagree with increasing prices. National parks are for all. Increasing prices have already and will continue to excluded those that can't afford the entry fee. The mission statement talks about preservation for this and generations to come. That should include all, not just those with sufficient funds.

---

Correspondence ID: 245Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 17:53:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

An increase in Daily Vehicle fee would not impact my number of visits. I support the part increasing fees, because I support having the funds to properly maintain and operate the park.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

An increase in campground overnight fees would not impact my number of visits. I support the part increasing fees, because I support having the funds to properly maintain and operate the park.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 246Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 18:50:32

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It would not affect our plans to visit. We purchase the annual pass every year to support the park. I think if the increase is

needed to maintain the park, then go ahead as long as you continue to be good stewards of money.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I typically do not use this, so really don't have a say. But as noted above, if you feel it is truly needed to maintain the park then do what's right.

Comments: I have been coming to the RMNP for over 35 years with my family. I absolutely love it and will always continue to bring my family. I am not a fan of the new timed entry that came about with covid. I would like to see this go away. One of the great things of staying in the ymca for a week or longer is having the ability to just drive in to the park when ever on the spur of the moment. Also trying to plan larger hikes are hard not knowing when you'll be acclimated, so you have to play games and get passes for everyday just incase. This is just taking spots that don't get used, so really not doing what's intended. Then there is the cost to reserve your entry? If I have an annual pass or week I shouldn't be subject to another fee to use.

---

Correspondence ID: 247Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 19:47:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It won't affect or deter my willingness to visit the park. I understand the cost to pay employees, cost of goods to maintain and repair the park, and to provide educational programs.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It won't affect my visitation to the park.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 248Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 20:16:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The price change would not change or affect my visit, but the benefits reaped by the park with more funding would greatly improve the quality and safety of my visit, in addition to the desire to return.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

The price change would not change or affect my visit, but the benefits reaped by the park with more funding would greatly improve the quality, efficiency, and safety of my camping and hiking experience.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 249Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 20:37:02

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I support A fee increase

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Agree

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 250Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,04 2022 22:22:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

We would probably plan a little better to visit. Make sure that we know when and where we are supposed to enter.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It wouldn't.

Comments: I'm all for protecting the park.

---

Correspondence ID: 251Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,05 2022 13:33:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Would have no affect

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Would have me reconsider my winter enjoyment of this park.

You propose increasing the non-winter camping fee from \$30 to \$35 per night, just over a 15% increase which is reasonable.

What I object to is the winter fee going from \$20 to \$35 per night, a 75% increase during a period when significant reduced services are available. All Forest Service and BLM as do most National Parks' campgrounds charge less during these winter months. Rocky Mountain should not be an exception to this practice.

Comments:

---

Correspondence ID: 252Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,05 2022 13:38:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Not at all. We love the controlled flow of guests through the park!!! It benefits the environment as well as the guests. As far as cost, not a problem. There is great expense in maintaining such a magnificent gift. \$5.00 hurts no one. The camping fees are long ..long overdue for an increase!!! Thank you for doing all that you all do to allow us the grand pleasure of visiting Rocky Mountain National Park!!!

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Not at all. Increased cost...is long overdue.

Comments: Just...thank you so very, very much!!!! I cannot imagine what it takes to keep it all flowing as well as it does!!!

---

Correspondence ID: 253Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,05 2022 16:37:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

The proposed \$5 increase to the entrance fee would not affect my visit to RMNP in any way. It is a nominal increase that would not deter me from visiting the park.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Same response as question 1.

Comments: While I have no issue with implementing the proposed \$5 increase, I am curious why you aren't proposing demand pricing. It seems that you could easily identify the busiest times in the park (either seasonally or day of the week)

and increase the entrance and camping fees by \$10 or even \$20 for those times. Pricing for lower demand times/seasons could remain as currently priced. This might give some visitors incentive to visit during lower demand times. Thank you.

---

Correspondence ID: 254Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,05 2022 19:49:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Sad to say this but we will probably stop coming. The reservation system is already ruining the experience and now this. Such a shame.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

It's already so difficult getting a reservation. We won't be coming anymore.

Comments: Please get rid of the reservation system. We live an hour away and can't get in now unless we planned it months in advance.

If the reservation system stays, at least have two lanes at the entrance so people with the National pass can get in quickly before the entrance time. We got there a half hour and by the time we got up to the gate, it was 9:05 and the ranger wouldn't let us in.

---

Correspondence ID: 255Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,05 2022 19:50:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

negatively, but not overly so at the moment. I already avoid your park because of the reservation system. An increase in the daily fee would mean I simply never go back instead of watching to see whether you get rid of the reservation system.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I don't camp there, so not at all

Comments: Get rid of the reservation system you initiated after covid. It never mitigated crowds in the park, merely prevented the locals from being able to come. Until less than a month ago, I lived under an hour's drive from Rocky, but I couldn't go because it was absolutely impossible to get a stupid reservation.

---

Correspondence ID: 256Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,06 2022 16:02:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Increasing the daily vehicle entrance fees would negatively effect my visit to the park because it would be more difficult for me to acquire the amount required and thus possibly be unable to visit.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Increasing the front-country campground overnight fees would negatively effect my visit to the park because it would be more difficult for me to acquire the amount required and thus possibly be unable to visit.

Comments: While I understand the financial need to complete projects within Rocky Mountain National Park, increasing entry and use fees also increases the financial burden of the public, who allegedly owns the park. As a concerned member of the public, I implore you all to find other ways to fund the necessary projects and keep fees at the status quo or even lower the fees you all currently assess.

---

Correspondence ID: 257Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,06 2022 18:07:41

Correspondence Type:

Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Daily vehicle entrance fee increases would negatively impact the ability of my clients to afford to access their public lands and disproportionately impact lower income demographics.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Front-country campground overnight fee increases would negatively impact the ability of my clients to afford to access their public lands and disproportionately impact lower income demographics.

Comments: January 6th, 2022

Rocky Mountain National Park  
Office of the Superintendent  
1000 US Hwy 36  
Estes Park, CO 80517

Dear Rocky Mountain National Park Staff,

The following comments come from [REDACTED] regarding the proposal to institute daily vehicle entrance fee and front-country campground overnight fee increases for Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado. Rewilding Expeditions is an Estes Park based guiding business that provides adventure trips with a focus on environmental education, wilderness stewardship, parkland protection and equitable access of wildlands.

The proposal calls for a five-dollar daily vehicle entrance fee increase, a five-dollar summer camping fee increase at all front-country campgrounds, a fifteen-dollar winter camping fee increase at Moraine Park Campground, and a ten-dollar group campsite fee increase at Glacier Basin Campground. Rocky Mountain National Park indicates the fees are necessary to fund projects such as: hazard tree mitigation, hiking trail repairs and improvements, wilderness campsite improvements, bear management, and restoration of historic rock walls along Trail Ridge Road. Rewilding Expeditions opposes the proposed fees for the following reasons:

1. They commodify the national park into an agency that only serves those who pay specific user fees when public lands exist at their core as a form of social equity - they belong to everyone and provide benefits to society as a whole.
2. They are an incentive to overdevelop the park, provide unnecessary amenities and promote only those things that bring in revenue. This path of overdevelopment only leads to a need to continually justify ever-increasing fees for "improvement" projects in high-use areas of the park, even in designated Wilderness.
3. They are used for development projects in high-use areas when the implementation of appropriate restricted access permit systems should be used first to disperse visitation instead. Permit systems, with no fees, would be a better tool to reduce crowding and site impact problems, such as the impacts seen along the popular East Longs Peak Trail. The "improvement" project along this trail, which would be supported by increased user fees, taints wilderness character by overdeveloping the wilderness trail corridor and is a direct disincentive to fixing the core problem that's causing erosion and degradation - overuse.
4. They are unnecessary and relied on to improve visitor services and fulfill park maintenance needs when all of the projects funded through the collection of user fees in the park could be funded through increased Congressional appropriations, increased investments from park partners (i.e. Rocky Conservancy) and private philanthropy, among other sources.
5. They create inequitable access to the national park for diverse demographics, directly discriminating against lower income people and excluding portions of the public from affording to access and enjoy their public lands. National parks should be working to make Wilderness more accessible by eliminating access barriers such as user fees that disproportionately impact people of color.

We ask that Rocky Mountain National Park does not increase daily vehicle entrance fees or front-country campground

overnight fees, and suggest that the funding necessary to improve visitor services and fulfill park maintenance needs be obtained through increased Congressional appropriation requests, non-profit partnership investments and private philanthropy to name a few. We strongly believe in permit systems, with no fees, to limit impacts in high-use areas as an alternative management strategy to the continued overdevelopment of facilities and other infrastructure, often in designated Wilderness.

Sincerely,

(b) (6)

---

Correspondence ID: 258Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,06 2022 18:18:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Daily vehicle entrance fee increases would negatively impact my ability to afford to access public lands.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Front-country campground overnight fee increases would negatively impact my ability to afford to access public lands and discourage use of campgrounds, specifically winter use of Moraine Park Campground.

Comments: January 6th, 2022

Rocky Mountain National Park  
Office of the Superintendent  
1000 US Hwy 36  
Estes Park, CO 80517

Dear Rocky Mountain National Park Staff,

The following comments come from [REDACTED] regarding the proposal to institute daily vehicle entrance fee and front-country campground overnight fee increases for Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado. I'm an Estes Park local and former Park Ranger of Rocky Mountain National Park that has a strong desire to see responsible management throughout the park and equitable public access.

The proposal calls for a five-dollar daily vehicle entrance fee increase, a five-dollar summer camping fee increase at all front-country campgrounds, a fifteen-dollar winter camping fee increase at Moraine Park Campground, and a ten-dollar group campsite fee increase at Glacier Basin Campground. Rocky Mountain National Park indicates the fees are necessary to fund projects such as: hazard tree mitigation, hiking trail repairs and improvements, wilderness campsite improvements, bear management, and restoration of historic rock walls along Trail Ridge Road. I oppose the proposed fees for the following reasons:

1. They commodify the national park into an agency that only serves those who pay specific user fees when public lands exist at their core as a form of social equity - they belong to everyone and provide benefits to society as a whole.
2. They are an incentive to overdevelop the park, provide unnecessary amenities and promote only those things that bring in revenue. This path of overdevelopment only leads to a need to continually justify ever-increasing fees for "improvement" projects in high-use areas of the park, even in designated Wilderness.
3. They are used for development projects in high-use areas when the implementation of appropriate restricted access permit systems should be used first to disperse visitation instead. Permit systems, with no fees, would be a better tool to reduce crowding and site impact problems, such as the impacts seen along the popular East Longs Peak Trail. The "improvement"

project along this trail, which would be supported by increased user fees, taints wilderness character by overdeveloping the wilderness trail corridor and is a direct disincentive to fixing the core problem that's causing erosion and degradation - overuse.

4. They are unnecessary and relied on to improve visitor services and fulfill park maintenance needs when all of the projects funded through the collection of user fees in the park could be funded through increased Congressional appropriations, increased investments from park partners (i.e. Rocky Conservancy) and private philanthropy, among other sources.

5. They create inequitable access to the national park for diverse demographics, directly discriminating against lower income people and excluding portions of the public from affording to access and enjoy their public lands. National parks should be working to make Wilderness more accessible by eliminating access barriers such as user fees that disproportionately impact people of color.

I ask that Rocky Mountain National Park does not increase daily vehicle entrance fees or front-country campground overnight fees, and suggest that the funding necessary to improve visitor services and fulfill park maintenance needs be obtained through increased Congressional appropriation requests, non-profit partnership investments and private philanthropy to name a few. I strongly believe in permit systems, with no fees, to limit impacts in high-use areas as an alternative management strategy to the continued overdevelopment of facilities and other infrastructure, often in designated Wilderness.

Sincerely,

(b) (6)

Correspondence ID: 259Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,06 2022 18:24:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

Daily vehicle entrance fee increases would negatively impact my ability to afford to access public lands.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Front-country campground overnight fee increases would negatively impact my ability to afford to access public lands and discourage use of campgrounds, specifically winter use of Moraine Park Campground.

Comments: January 6th, 2022

Rocky Mountain National Park  
Office of the Superintendent  
1000 US Hwy 36  
Estes Park, CO 80517

Dear Rocky Mountain National Park Staff,

The following comments come from (b) (6) regarding the proposal to institute daily vehicle entrance fee and front-country campground overnight fee increases for Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado. I'm an Estes Park local that has a strong desire to see responsible management throughout the park and equitable public access.

The proposal calls for a five-dollar daily vehicle entrance fee increase, a five-dollar summer camping fee increase at all front-country campgrounds, a fifteen-dollar winter camping fee increase at Moraine Park Campground, and a ten-dollar group campsite fee increase at Glacier Basin Campground. Rocky Mountain National Park indicates the fees are necessary to fund projects such as: hazard tree mitigation, hiking trail repairs and improvements, wilderness campsite improvements, bear management, and restoration of historic rock walls along Trail Ridge Road. I oppose the proposed fees for the following reasons:

1. They commodify the national park into an agency that only serves those who pay specific user fees when public lands exist at their core as a form of social equity - they belong to everyone and provide benefits to society as a whole.

2. They are an incentive to overdevelop the park, provide unnecessary amenities and promote only those things that bring in revenue. This path of overdevelopment only leads to a need to continually justify ever-increasing fees for "improvement" projects in high-use areas of the park, even in designated Wilderness.

3. They are used for development projects in high-use areas when the implementation of appropriate restricted access permit systems should be used first to disperse visitation instead. Permit systems, with no fees, would be a better tool to reduce crowding and site impact problems, such as the impacts seen along the popular East Longs Peak Trail. The "improvement" project along this trail, which would be supported by increased user fees, taints wilderness character by overdeveloping the wilderness trail corridor and is a direct disincentive to fixing the core problem that's causing erosion and degradation - overuse.

4. They are unnecessary and relied on to improve visitor services and fulfill park maintenance needs when all of the projects funded through the collection of user fees in the park could be funded through increased Congressional appropriations, increased investments from park partners (i.e. Rocky Conservancy) and private philanthropy, among other sources.

5. They create inequitable access to the national park for diverse demographics, directly discriminating against lower income people and excluding portions of the public from affording to access and enjoy their public lands. National parks should be working to make Wilderness more accessible by eliminating access barriers such as user fees that disproportionately impact people of color.

I ask that Rocky Mountain National Park does not increase daily vehicle entrance fees or front-country campground overnight fees, and suggest that the funding necessary to improve visitor services and fulfill park maintenance needs be obtained through increased Congressional appropriation requests, non-profit partnership investments and private philanthropy to name a few. I strongly believe in permit systems, with no fees, to limit impacts in high-use areas as an alternative management strategy to the continued overdevelopment of facilities and other infrastructure, often in designated Wilderness.

Sincerely,

(b) (6)

Correspondence ID: 260Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,06 2022 18:57:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

A better question is how would an increase in daily vehicle entrance fees impact park accessibility. A fee increase makes it harder for low-income families to visit their national park and unfairly bars certain populations from enjoying their public lands. The federal government should be adequately funding the park. The burden should not be placed on visitors.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

Same answer as above.

Comments:

Correspondence ID: 261Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,07 2022 11:15:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I would gladly pay an increase to visit my favorite place on earth, the money is well used to keep it maintained yet wild. Fully support the increase as goods, services and park employees all cost more.



Comments: Topic Question 2:

Camping in RMNP is a wonderful, memory rich experience for me and my son. Hope to get up there this year and the increase would not hinder at all, glad to pay more for this wonderful camping time together.

Comments: Few things are as pleasurable to me as visiting our national parks, Rocky Mountain is my favorite and accessible by a days hard drive from Oklahoma. I am a senior and introduced my son to RMNP when he was just 5 years old. We visit as often as we can and will gladly support the increase in entrance and camping fees. Thank you for all you do to keep this place sacred and wild.

---

Correspondence ID: 262Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,07 2022 21:45:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

I am fine with a daily vehicle entrance fee increase if I am able to purchase a pass directly day of visit just like I used to be able to in 2018. The timed entry reservation system doesn't allow for flexibility, but determines family/couple trips and vacations to be planned months out on exactly what hikes (since the new system implemented last year) divided the park to Bear Lake Road Corridor and the rest of RMNP. The system is bogged down on the days when passes get released, and if you don't get a pass then you are relying your whole trip to be able to hike at the 2-day ahead of day release schedule. People have been traveling to RMNP for YEARS and DECADES, to put a cap on how many people are allowed in the park is limiting everyone's access. Do away the timed reservation day passes, bring back a true day pass that I can purchase day as well the equally enjoyable week pass, which would allow for greater access. Stop messing with people's time and vacations. RMNP is supposed to be, and has been in other years, a relaxing place to visit and get away from the hustle and bustle but with this system it only adds stress and complications, as well as longer lines.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

I have not done overnight camping in RMNP, so this question doesn't apply to me.

Comments: If people are wanting to hike and enjoy what nature has to offer, then let them come in at their leisure. You have implemented the shuttle system when parking lots are full, and seasoned visitors know in order to get to a trailhead they will need to arrive early. By moving the time forward this past year for passes to start at 5am instead of 6am, you are only further allowing for a divide or for people to rush through Estes in order to grab a spot and wait or start their hike super early. I beg of you as the "only national park with a daily vehicle entrance pass" quoted from your Instagram, bring back the Original Vehicle Entrance Pass and get rid of the Timed Entry Reservation System - forever!!!

It states on your National Park Service website the timed entry permit system is temporary. This has been in affect for two years, remove it and let people visit the park like they used to.

The News Release stating the RMNP Proposes Changes in Entrance and Camping Fees, with no change happening to the park weekly pass (\$35 per week), but according to the RMNP website this pass is not listed as an option, and as far as I have researched on the website and the reservation site (recreation.gov) this pass no longer exists. Bring back this pass as most people who come to visit RMNP choose to recreate and see this beautiful site for more than one day usually.

I understand that the rules for the timed entry right now are, as long as you enter the park at your assigned time, then you can re-enter later in the day if you need/want to. Thats all fine and dandy but also totally relies on me getting a park pass for the day in the first place.

You as a park are limiting park capacity to 75-85% as stated on your website as you see fit for shuttle, low amount of staff, and the fire damage from 2020. I understand you dont want to stretch anyone too thin, but with not allowing people to enjoy the park you are limiting the bountiful gifts the park has to offer.

So Ill say it again, raise the prices \$5, fine, do it, Ill pay it. But get rid of the timed entry reservation system and bring back the freedom to experience the park!! Sincerely a visitor since 2004.

---

Correspondence ID: 263Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,07 2022 21:58:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 1:

It wouldn't as I use the America The Beautiful Pass.

Comments: Topic Question 2:

This is the fee increase that bothers me the most. The increase of the winter camping fee at the Moraine Park Campground from \$20 to \$35 is inexcusable. This represents a fee increase of over FORTY PERCENT! This is taking advantage of RMNP's heartiest winter campers. And exactly what additional amenities are going to be offered for this massive hike? Nothing was mentioned?

I understand the need for the park to generate revenue but this is nothing but a money grab.

Not many use this campground in the winter but it is pretty much the only primitive campground available in the winter in the Front Range. And at \$35 per night I can only think RMNP's goal is to shutter this campground in the winter when the attendance rate plummets. Additionally, at \$35 per night the amount of services available in the winter does not match what you get in the summer. There is absolutely no reason for the winter rate to match the summer rate. It should be less not the same.

I sincerely hope that isn't the goal as I enjoy using this campground in the winter while enjoying this amazing park off season. At \$35 it is simply too much money for me to continue to use this campground in the winter. Please don't raise the fee over 40 percent. It isn't fair to the winter campers of this park.

Comments: Please don't change the format of the Timber Creek Campground - please keep it first come first serve. Also, please consider opening this campground to the public again.

---

Correspondence ID: 264Project:105454Document:116600

Received: Jan,07 2022 22:15:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Topic Question 2:

Camping was once an affordable way to visit a Park and spend time there amidst its wonders.

It would be prohibitive. One wants to spend more than one day in such a wonderful place. Quickly it is becoming unaffordable.

years ago one might consider a journey to multiple parks, it becomes beyond budget now with fees like this for many of us.

Comments:

The National Parks are our national natural heritage, special places that belong to all of us.

They are quickly becoming the recreational destinations for upper income folks, becoming the "elitist playgrounds" that some appropriators have used as rationale to decrease funding for our National Parks.

The Commercial model that has been instituted does fail to reflect an understanding of these places preserved for all the people.:

and enjoyment and appreciation is dependent on economic resources that diminish access for those with limited income.

"These proposed campground fee increases are based on comparable fees for similar services in nearby campgrounds."

The proposed fee increases are necessary for Rocky Mountain National Park to improve and

maintain high-quality visitor services. While basic park operations are funded by direct appropriations from Congress, the recreation use fees collected by the park are used to support new projects and the ongoing maintenance of park facilities that directly enhance the visitor experience

This represents a major failure of responsibility that important measures to protect and maintain the resources and facilities in our Parks do not receive adequate support.:

\*\*\*\*\*

